

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 17, 1990

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MAZZOLI].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 13, 1990.

I hereby designate the Honorable ROMANO L. MAZZOLI to act as Speaker pro tempore on Monday, September 17, 1990.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We give thanks, O gracious God, for this new day with all its opportunities. We pray that we may be worthy of the high calling that You have given us to be ambassadors of good will and witness to lives of service. Remind us to use the abilities You have given us to tell the message of understanding and to do those things that bring peace and justice to every person. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) will please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4, rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill on Friday, September 14, 1990.

S. 2088, to extend titles 1 and 2 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 580) "An act to require institutions of higher education receiving Federal financial assistance to provide certain information with respect to the graduation rates of student-athletes at such institutions," with an amendment.

The message also announced that the Senate disapproves to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) "An act to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, to provide for agricultural export, resource conservation, farm credit, and agricultural research and related programs, to ensure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LEAHY, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BOREN, Mr. KERREY, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DOLE, and Mr. COCHRAN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2924. An act to expand the meat inspection programs of the United States by establishing a comprehensive inspection program to ensure the quality and wholesomeness of all fish products intended for human consumption in the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 3033. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow free mailing privileges to be extended to members of the Armed Forces while engaged in temporary military operations under arduous circumstances.

AMERICA THREATENED WITH FULL-FLEDGED DEPRESSION

(Mr. GEJDENSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, this economy is heading not for a recession but for a massive depression. With a combination of increased oil prices and bank credit virtually disappearing in the Northeast, if we add to that a repressive tax policy, placing more burden on blue collar and middle class

workers, we will bring this economy to a screeching halt.

We have spent \$4 trillion since World War II defending Europe and Japan. It is time to end that program. It is time to take those dollars and stimulate the American economy back to life. We need to make low interest loans available for housing, and we need to put our construction industry back to work. We need to revive this economy or all the attempts at debt reduction will only further slow this already devastated economy. In those States with the most economic activity and the most population, we are already deep into a recession.

This Congress and this administration had better recognize that Gramm-Rudman may be a law we face, but the laws of economics are catching up to us and we need to stimulate this economy back to life. We have tried supply-side economics. We have gone from a \$900 billion debt to a \$3 trillion debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to take a look at some good old-fashioned economics, putting people back to work and starting this economy back up again.

LET US TAKE ANOTHER LOOK AT EGYPTIAN DEBT FORGIVENESS

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a pleasant surprise in today's crisis in the Persian Gulf is the solid support we've had from so many Arab nations. In fact, we've been so taken aback, that we may have lost our senses.

I am talking about plans to forgive \$7 billion in loans to Egypt.

Egypt now has 5,000 soldiers alongside the American troops in Saudi Arabia, and they will soon be sending more. We appreciate their support, and I am sure there are ways America and other nations can help them alleviate some of the economic problems caused by this crisis.

But America can't afford outright cancellation of Egypt's debt. America has \$64 billion in existing loans throughout the world. Some countries are already beginning to line up at the debt forgiveness window.

This comes at a time when our budget negotiators are figuring out ways to squeeze a few more tax dollars

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

out of America's sales clerks and farms and mechanics.

America has a reputation for being generous, but let's remember who's going to end up footing the bill.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues might like to take a look at the scope of America's debt, and I include the attached list of the top 10 debtor nations to the U.S. Government for printing in the RECORD, as follows:

10 LARGEST CASES OF DEBT

[In dollars as of Dec. 31, 1989]

Country	Total debt (billions)	Arrearages
Egypt	12.3	550,000,000
Israel	4.6	764,000
Pakistan	3.3	335,000
Poland	2.9	398,000,000
India	2.8	52,000
Turkey	2.8	90,000,000
Indonesia	2.4	602,000
Brazil	2.2	851,000,000
Korea, Republic of	1.9	4,000,000
Greece	1.8	22,000,000
Total	35.2	1,900,000,000
World total	64	4,300,000,000

A PRESCRIPTION FOR ADDRESSING THE PERSIAN GULF AFFAIR

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Persian Gulf is really heating up. President Bush did a good job on Iraqi TV. I commend him for that.

Leona Helmsley wrote a letter to Saddam Hussein in the New York Times. That is right, the "Hostess with the mostess" has taken Hussein to task. Here is what she said:

Mr. Hussein, the people that you hold in your grasp are not guests, they are hostages.

If anybody should know the difference, believe me, it is Leona Helmsley. Very carefully, she also said this: "It is time for you, Mr. Hussein, to check out."

I have a suggestion about this letter. I recommend to the President that he send both Leona Helmsley and Judge David Souter to the gulf. After Judge David Souter completely confuses Saddam Hussein, Leona Helmsley can get close enough to maybe kick him in the crotch and end this thing.

In all fairness, Mr. Speaker, this war of words may end up in a war of body bags. I think it is unfair for Americans to keep receiving their sons and daughters and loved ones in pine boxes. It is time for the rest of the world to not only come up with the cash but to shed some blood alongside our Americans for peace as well.

JAPAN AND GERMANY RESPOND

(Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, last week I criticized both Japan and Germany for not shouldering a proportional share of the financial burden in the Middle East. But today, Mr. Speaker, I thank these allies for their new offers of assistance to the 27-nation military force in the gulf.

Jolted by international criticism both Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu announced that his country will add \$3 billion to the \$1 billion already committed 2 weeks ago and in West Germany, Chancellor Kohl has also pledged another \$2 billion. These much-needed and additional amounts of financial assistance go a long way to help ensure international law and order and protect the small nations in the Persian Gulf region from madman Saddam.

Mr. Speaker, although overdue, we should be grateful for this additional assistance from our allies. And I am. America did basically write their constitutions 45 years ago. And those constitutions do have some restrictions on their military and financial obligations in regard to international crises. But I am delighted that they saw their way clear to assist the cause of international law and peace with their generous financial contributions. Friends help friends in time of need. I thank our German and Japanese friends.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 14, 1990]

JAPAN DEFENDS AID TO U.S. IN MIDEAST

(By Steven R. Weisman)

TOKYO, September 14.—Jolted by mounting criticism of Japan in Washington, Government officials asserted that Japan had done more than any other country in the world outside the gulf region to aid the American buildup in the Middle East and added that another \$3 billion in assistance to the region would be announced later this morning.

The officials also said that \$2 billion of the amount, for economic assistance to Jordan, Egypt and Turkey, would include a fast infusion of \$600 million to make up for revenues those countries lost because of the sanctions against Iraq.

In addition, the officials said another \$1 billion would be used for assistance to the multinational military effort in the gulf beyond the \$1 billion announced two weeks ago.

DIRECT MONEY TRANSFER FORBIDDEN

The new money would bring to \$4 billion the total amount Japan has committed to the Persian Gulf since the beginning of the crisis caused by the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait on Aug. 2.

[In West Germany, Chancellor Helmut Kohl also pledged more help, apparently trying to soften the anger expressed by Congress that Bonn is not pulling its weight in the Persian Gulf. He did not offer many details.]

While Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu announced the previous pledge of \$1 billion, only one shipment of goods, consisting of

800 vehicles, has gone to the Middle East so far.

Shipments of such goods by Japan have been delayed for several reasons, partly because of the reluctance of Japan Airlines and independent shippers to send material into a combat zone.

Japanese officials also said Tokyo had to wait for the creation of a legal entity before it can in effect write a check to help pay for the American military effort.

Japanese officials said a direct transfer of money by Japan to another country, like the United States, is forbidden by law unless it is for certain specific purposes, like economic assistance or disaster relief. "As soon as we finish working out a scheme in cooperation with the United States Government, the money can be processed," a Japanese official said.

A larger obstacle to Japanese assistance has been the interpretation long applied to the Constitution written by the United States after the end of World War II. The Constitution rules out use of force by Japan in pursuit of its interests. Tokyo has cited the clause in rejecting an American appeal to send minesweepers, refueling tankers and other equipment.

VEHICLES, HOUSING, MONEY

Japanese officials said that while other nongulf countries had sent troops and ships to the Middle East, no country outside the region had come up with a sum anywhere near the \$1 billion Japan had already committed.

Kuwait's exiled Emir has said he will contribute about \$5 billion to the effort before the end of the year, and the Saudis have promised to contribute about \$500 million a month. The United Arab Emirates has also pledged a sizeable contribution.

The Japanese assistance is to come largely in the form of vehicles, housing, air-conditioning equipment and other goods, as well as direct financial support for the multinational military effort.

In addition, officials said the \$2 billion for Jordan, Egypt and Turkey would help their economic development in the years ahead.

It has not been clear, however, whether the \$2 billion in economic aid is to be in addition to or part of the roughly \$10 billion a year Japan has committed in recent years for economic development assistance for poor countries.

DISMAYED BY AMENDMENT

Officials said Thursday night that they were especially dismayed by the passage on Wednesday of an anti-Japanese amendment to a military spending bill in the United States House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote of 370 to 53.

"Some of those 370 congressmen may not be aware that Japan is the biggest supporter of United States forces overseas," Taizo Watanabe, the Foreign Ministry spokesman, said in an interview Thursday night. "We hope that once they know the full magnitude of what we are doing, their appreciation will increase."

Other officials warned that the part of the resolution calling for a reduction in American forces in Japan was potentially dangerous. The resolution called for a cut of 5,000 troops each year if Tokyo does not increase its support for the 50,000 American troops on Japanese soil.

"These resolutions are coming out of pure ignorance," said a Foreign Ministry official, who spoke on the condition that he not be identified. "To withdraw 5,000 troops a year for Japan is sheer nonsense. It would de-

stroy not only the national interest of Japan, but of the United States as well."

PROTECTING AMERICAN INTERESTS

He added that American troops are in Japan "not for the narrow purpose of defending Japan alone," but to protect American interests in the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

The resolution calls for Tokyo to increase support of the American troops to \$4.5 billion, a year. According to the United States, Japan's present contribution is \$2.8 billion a year, about 37 percent of the total cost.

Japanese officials repeated on Thursday what they have been saying in recent months, that Tokyo would try to increase the sum in the years ahead.

But the tone of the statements was one of alarm, apparently mixed with a feeling that criticism in the United States seemed to be inevitable because of what some have acknowledged to be the delays in Japanese assistance.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 14, 1990]

YEN, MARKS AND THE GULF

It probably was inevitable that as soon as someone started to talk about creating a new world order, the demagogues would come out of the woodwork. They could be heard around the U.S. Capitol this week as Congressmen, rained down denunciations on Japan and Germany for not pulling their weight in the Gulf. "History has shown that we need to be tough to get action from Japan," thundered ex-dove Rep. David Bonior of Michigan. With Saddam Hussein still fat and sassy in Baghdad, this may not be the best time for some of the West's major powers to go off into an alley for a fistfight.

There is indeed a case to be made that Japan and especially Germany should be doing more to support the Gulf intervention. It would be helpful, though, if all the engaged parties brought more sophistication to the question of the Japanese-German contribution than was on display in the House this week.

For instance, the arguments over what kind of help Japan should send, and how much, bring us closer to the day when the world must face the rebirth of Japan as a leading military power. Even with its defense budget held just under 1% of gross national product, Japan already ranks among the world's top five nations in defense spending. Still, there are people beyond the Beltway—including Asians who recall Japan's behavior in World War II—who harbor misgivings about a more military-minded Japan. Since that time, of course, the Japanese have been learning better ways of integrating themselves into the world.

Japan's awesome productivity has provided cars, stereos, televisions, watches, computers and cameras that people world-wide have flocked to buy. Japan now is opening, even if slowly, to imports, out of a belated recognition that its workers are entitled to more fruits of their labor. Far more Japanese are traveling abroad, thereby becoming more cosmopolitan in their outlook.

Moreover, the challenges these past few years to the long-ruling Liberal Democratic Party suggest that the democratic process is starting to seriously permeate Japanese society. The electorate is fed up with unresponsive LDP leaders who bulldozed through an unpopular consumption tax and whose protectionist policies have served a few special interests at the expense of consumers.

Japan, in short, has been evolving toward a society open and flexible enough to know the full value of safeguarding the democratic order. The big question is whether Japan has already reached the point at which its allies, and its own citizens, can trust it to stand strictly by the guns of democracy. Perhaps. What's clear is that Japan has for a long time been moving in the right direction.

The trick is to encourage that movement, including a greater Gulf commitment, without driving them back into a shell. For the moment, Japan's Prime Minister Kakuji Tanaka has offered a Persian Gulf aid package worth some \$1 billion. Yesterday Japan's Justice Minister supported a review of the country's constitution to allow sending non-combat troops to the Gulf, while another member of the Kakuji cabinet stated that, "We have a large role to play in restoring peace in the Gulf . . . and we should take up our responsibilities."

The situation with the Germans is in some ways more troublesome. Over the past several years, Germany practically developed a for-profit foreign policy; while the government was busy with other things, many German firms developed intimate relations with Saddam Hussein. The German government is investigating 60 companies suspected of making weapons-related sales to Baghdad. West German firms are said to have been in the forefront of Iraq's development of poison gas capabilities. And this came after a scandal in which German firms stood accused of supplying Libyan chemical plants.

Last weekend Helmut Kohl acknowledged that other nations could say of Germany, "If there is money to be made, they're there, but if the issue is taking responsibility, they evade it." Yesterday Mr. Kohl called it "impossible" for a newly united Germany to remain uninvolved, and tomorrow Secretary of State Baker will meet with the German President to discuss this matter.

What we are seeing here is a process of awakening. Just as Germany was able to recognize and seize the momentum of history in German reunification, the coalition arrayed against Iraq's international piracy represents another turning point in the world's accelerating transformation. With so much at stake, it is important to push back against the sort of potentially destructive demagoguery on display in Congress this week, but it also is essential for Germany and Japan to recognize that an event is occurring in which both should be important participants.

□ 1210

LOOK TO WINDFALL PROFITS AS SOURCE OF REDUCING FEDERAL DEFICIT

(Mr. McCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, some very difficult decisions are about to be made in the summit. It is amazing what is being left out.

Notice on the front page of the New York Times yesterday, the profits of the four largest oil companies are up 40 percent, and that is even with modification or an evasion program that

has been basically endorsed by the White House and other high ranking Republican legislative sources.

At the same time, we are asking the American people to pay more taxes and talking about drastic cuts in Medicare. When are we going to wake up and stop these basic injustices from cutting against the American people?

Similarly, there is \$3.8 billion that the administration is asking over the next 4 years against the Postal Service. The U.S. Postal Service operates on revenues from mailers, not from funds from the Treasury. The \$6 billion which the Postal Service will be required to transfer to the Treasury over the next 4 years is nothing more than a stamp tax. The general public will be required to pay more for its stamps to mask the size of the Federal deficit.

Other proposals being discussed include increasing Medicare premiums and freezing Federal pensions. I find these proposals unconscionable, because they affect those who can least afford it.

One group that can afford some of this is the oil companies. Let us talk about them a little bit.

DEMOCRATS SEEK TO LEAD ECONOMY INTO RECESSION AND INFLATION AGAIN

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, some liberal economists have suggested that the only way to reduce the Federal deficit is to inflate our way out of it. In other words, reduce the value of everyone's dollars, so that the Federal deficit looks smaller by comparison.

The Democrats have evidently been listening to that kind of bad advice. Their proposals to raise taxes are inherently inflationary.

The Democrats propose to raise excise taxes, including energy taxes. Such tax increases are by definition inflationary because they assure higher prices and spread the harm throughout the economy.

The Democrats also propose to raise tax rates. That means money gets pulled out of the productive sector of the economy, out of productive investments, and put into shelters. Any additional money collected by the Government is also something which tends to be inflationary. Productive decline is inflationary by definition.

Just 10 years after leading the economy into recession and inflation at the same time, the Democrats are proposing to go in that direction again. It makes no economic sense.

TEXTILE BILL WOULD SAVE JOBS, PROTECT CONSUMERS

(Mrs. LLOYD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to let my colleagues know that a vote for the textile bill is a vote for good sound, domestic policy. H.R. 4328, the Textile, Apparel and Footwear Trade Act is a good bill for all concerned, including the consumer.

I have heard a great deal lately about how this legislation, by restricting imports, will cut out the competition for the domestic manufacturers; thereby leading to higher prices for consumer goods. These critics of the textile bill would have us sit up here in Washington and watch the textile mills and apparel factories of this country disappear one by one. Already this year, over 43,000 American workers have lost their jobs because of nearly 70 textile and apparel plants that have shut their doors.

And all of this because of a supposed threat to consumers. I say that if there is a threat to the consumer, it does not emanate from the textile industry. If you look closely, it is true that imports cost less than American made goods at the wholesale level, but to the consumer at the cash register the price is generally the same. Where is the big savings imports are supposed to carry with them? And what is going to happen when the market share for imports continues to climb from the current 60 to 85 or 90 percent? Import saturation is a very dangerous thing whether we are talking about oil or textiles. The potential price increase and threat to the consumer comes from a foreign controlled market, not a healthy domestic manufacturing industry.

CUTTING TAXES FOR RICH NOT ACCEPTABLE TO MAINSTREAM AMERICA

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, last week the national press reported that the Republicans put forth a proposal at Andrews Air Force Base in terms of the budget summit to cut taxes \$11 billion for those with incomes over \$50,000, and to increase taxes for those middle income Americans under \$50,000 by some \$4.1 billion. Hardest hit by the GOP plan are those with incomes between \$20,000-\$40,000 who would be levied \$2.8 billion more in taxes.

The question is who leaked this information, that cast the GOP in a bad light? That was the question that was being raised on the Senate floor last

Friday when this came to light and was reported by the national media.

All the media had to look at was the President's tax cut proposals on Tuesday night. The President gave us a talk about how we all have to tighten up our belts and cut spending by \$500 billion over 5 years. Then he proceeded to list five tax cuts; that's right, tax cuts. The leading one, of course, is the President's pet, the capital gains tax reduction, 80 percent of which benefits go to those with over \$100,000 income.

Then he added a tax break for the oil companies. That is just great! Is that what America needs today? As the oil companies are profiteering from the problem in the Persian Gulf, they need another tax break right now according to President Bush.

The fact is that these types of inequitable measures are nonstarters in terms of a budget solution, as far as our constituents and the people we represent are concerned.

The Democrats have tabled a proposal that does address the problem that we have with regard to the budget. In fact, they decrease taxes for those with less than \$20,000 in income in a specific proposal. The administration and Congress must raise revenue. We should begin to reestablish a pay-as-you-go system for our Federal budget.

That has been sadly lacking during the decade of the 1980's. There was, and still exists today, an unwillingness to pay for the programs that have been put in place and are being proposed even today.

The President last Tuesday pointed out he wants to maintain the type of defense spending we have had, with all of the exotic weapons systems, such as star wars, redundant systems, nuclear weapon systems, remnants of the cold war at best useful under past circumstances. And such weapons are not helping us in terms of the type of crises that we face today, in the Persian Gulf.

We need defense dollars that make sense, that provide not for redundant weapons systems, but provide for the real needs of our sailors and soldiers on the front lines. We need a Federal budget with which we can go back to our constituents and present that has equity in terms of taxes and program changes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the summitters are paying attention to their constituents and to the other Members who do not have the privilege of working in the negotiations because the rank and file will not act positively to measures that are so badly out of balance and unacceptable to the mainstream of our constituents.

Following is the full text of the Washington Post, September 14, 1990 article which reports the ongoing budget negotiation proposals.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1990]

GOP'S TAX PROPOSAL SAID TO FAVOR WEALTHY

(By John E. Yang)

Bush administration budget negotiators proposed a package of tax increases that would cut the assessments for taxpayers whose annual incomes are more than \$50,000 while raising taxes for those whose incomes are lower, officials familiar with the proceedings said yesterday.

A Democratic tax offer, on the other hand, would cut taxes for those with incomes lower than \$20,000 a year while raising them for those with higher incomes, officials said.

It was not clear last night where the competing proposals stood as White House and congressional officials continued their budget talks at the Andrews Air Force Base Officer's Club.

The administration tax offer contains several controversial elements, including plans to limit the federal deductibility of state and local income taxes and to cut the capital gains tax rate, the officials said. It also includes such revenue-losing provisions as extending tax credits for research and development activities. Individual income tax rates would not be changed.

The Democratic offer would impose a 20 percent surtax on those with incomes of more than \$500,000 a year and a 10 percent tax on the purchase of such luxury items as automobiles and boats that cost more than \$30,000, jewelry with price tags higher than \$5,000, electronic equipment costing more than \$1,000 and furs costing more than \$500, the officials said.

Both include competing provisions to raise taxes on energy and alcoholic beverages. They also have several items in common, including boosts in the federal tax on airline tickets and tax breaks for domestic oil and gas exploration, the officials said.

The administration plan would cut taxes for taxpayers whose incomes are more than \$50,000 a year by \$11 billion over five years while raising taxes by \$4.1 billion for those with lower incomes, according to an analysis that Congress's nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation produced for the bargain-ers. The income figures in the analysis are for individual or joint tax returns.

Those whose annual incomes are more than \$100,000 would have their taxes cut \$2.9 billion over five years and those with income higher than \$200,000 a year would pay \$7.4 billion less in taxes.

Hardest hit would be individuals and families with incomes between \$20,000 and \$40,000 a year, who would pay \$2.8 billion more over five years than under current law, according to the analysis. Overall, individual income tax receipt would be reduced by \$7 billion over five years by the administration proposal.

The shifting tax burden would be much different under the Democratic plan, according to the Joint Committee on taxation. Those whose annual incomes are lower than \$20,000 would pay \$4 billion less over five years than under current law, with those taking in between \$10,000 and \$20,000 would benefit by \$3.5 billion.

Those with incomes higher than \$20,000 would have their tax bills increased by \$26.8 billion under the Democratic plan. The greatest increase would fall on those with incomes of more than \$200,000 who would pay \$8.9 billion more in taxes. In all, individual income taxes would rise a total of \$22.8 billion.

Fairness has been the keystone of the Democrats' arguments over the tax component of an hoped-for five-year, \$500 billion deficit-reduction plan that would save \$50 billion in the first year. Republicans, on the other hand, have been adamant that individual income taxes not rise.

Democrats have maintained that they would not accept President Bush's proposed capital gains tax cut, which they contend would disproportionately benefit the rich, without an accompanying increase in taxes on the wealthy.

The administration tax plan would place a \$10,000 limit on the amount of state and local taxes that could be deducted on federal income tax returns. Strongly opposed by lawmakers from states with high income taxes, the provision would generate \$35 billion in new revenue over five years, the officials said.

Among the provisions in the Democratic plan, is an extension of the 1.45 percent Medicare payroll tax to cover all taxpayers' incomes. Currently, the levy is paid only on the first \$51,300 of wages.

Negotiators met yesterday at Andrews for a seventh day of sequestered bargaining that they hope will be the final phase of talks. They have vowed to keep working until the talks either produce agreement or break down irrevocably.

The negotiators recessed about 10 o'clock last night and will resume talks at 11 a.m. today.

House Speaker Thomas S. Foley (D-Wash.) said yesterday he was still optimistic that a deal could be reached by the end of the week. Grinning, he quickly added: "Sunday is the end of the week for me. . . . Whatever we think it is going to take, it is going to take longer." Bush administration officials said a conclusion of the negotiations was not likely before next week.

The pace of the talks was "glacial," an official said yesterday. "There is no single issue holding it up," Foley said. "There are a lot of tough issues in every aspect of disagreement. . . . They are all difficult."

Among the most difficult are taxes and a proposal, first made by Sen. Phil Gramm (R-Tex.), to require upper-income Medicare recipients to pay higher premiums for the voluntary coverage of most physician and hospital out-patient services, the officials said.

Bargainers appeared to be backing away from the proposal, which has been incorporated into Democratic offers, as lawmakers outside the talks expressed opposition to the proposal.

NEW ARMS TRANSFERS IN GULF REGION WOULD EXACERBATE SITUATION

(Mr. BERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by the reports we have received in the last week of arms transfers to Saudi Arabia of some of the most sophisticated munitions in the United States arsenal.

It is not because I do not appreciate the role the Saudis are playing in the current crisis. On the contrary, they are doing their utmost to uphold our common interests in the current crisis. If the presence of foreign troops in

Saudi Arabia causes them inconvenience or discomfort, the Saudis tolerate them because they have made the calculation that their survival depends on it.

But we cannot let the reigning good will between us obscure the strategic military and political realities in the gulf region:

No matter what we sell to Saudi Arabia, it will never be able to defend itself against a well-armed Iraq; it simply has not got the soldiers and no demographic miracle will change that fact.

There is no guarantee that when the Saudis take delivery of the first of these weapons in 2 to 10 years that the government in power will be one with which we agree; note well that when the United States Government requested armored personnel carriers for Saudi Arabia earlier this year, it justified the sale as a useful mechanism for quelling internal disturbances.

The United States has got to consider regional arms control for the gulf region as the only sensible end game of the current crisis. Unrestrained arms sales to the region will only exacerbate the already catastrophic situation. This fix is simple and stupid. The administration will find lots of us on the Hill willing to discuss more sensible solutions if it only comes up here to consult with us.

SECRETARY YEUTTER HIGHLIGHTS FARM PROBLEMS

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, in Chicago this past Friday, Agriculture Secretary Clayton Yeutter highlighted the dangers of short-term solutions for farm country's problems. As he so correctly pointed out, what agriculture wants and needs is consistency, predictability and flexibility.

The Food Security Act of 1985, crafted in this Chamber under the leadership of my colleagues Mr. DE LA GARZA and Mr. MADIGAN, refocused U.S. farm programs on long-term, market-oriented policies, and helped get agriculture on the road to recovery during the worst depression to hit rural America in 60 years.

Secretary Yeutter is urging us to avoid repeating the policy mistakes of the past.

We need to keep our commodity loan rates at levels that prevent USDA from getting back into the grain business.

Farmers need simple, predictable planting flexibility to: encourage the experimentation of new crops; utilize pest management options; implement crop rotation plans; and, to allow them

to manage their farm in a common sense manner.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the Secretary's speech into the RECORD. While I do not agree with all of his policy criticisms and while I chafe at his legitimate criticisms of the legislative process—particularly relative to the budget—in Congress that is holding farmers hostage, I believe Secretary Yeutter's remarks should be required reading for all who labor to complete the 1990 farm bill.

REMARKS BY CLAYTON YEUTTER, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, TO THE CHICAGO FARMERS, SEPTEMBER 14, 1990

It's a great pleasure for me to be back in Chicago, especially when it means seeing so many friends and acquaintances. I'd like to thank The Chicago Farmers for extending to me this invitation to talk with you today about America's agricultural future.

As you know, Congress is struggling to resolve differences between their respective versions of the 1990 Farm Bill. What you may not know—and what I'd like to discuss with you today—is that in several notable instances neither version reflects what America's farmers have asked for, nor what America's farmers, as well as America's consumers, need.

At stake here is, quite literally, the future of America's farmers, and our competitiveness in the years and decades ahead.

A BLAST FROM THE PAST

To fully appreciate what is at stake in this upcoming Farm Bill, one only has to recall what America's farmers went through during what I refer to as "The Dark Ages," that period in the early 1980's when Congress argued that it could safely raise support levels without damaging competitiveness, without causing higher budget outlays, without leading to increased supply controls, and without hurting American agriculture.

The end result of this "reign of error" was a near-catastrophic failure of America's farming industry and a full-blown depression among America's farmers.

Our competitors climbed under our price umbrella, increased production and undersold us in the marketplace. Here at home, exports plummeted, farm incomes shrank while farm program costs skyrocketed and land prices fell into the pits. Most tragic of all, thousands of otherwise good, productive farmers—some of them no doubt your neighbors—simply disappeared, losing out not to better farmers from across the country, but to misguided, short-sighted farm policies enacted by non-farmer politicians in Washington, D.C.

Thankfully, enlightenment—and just plain old common sense—was there, just waiting to be used. In 1985, at the height of our farm depression, a farm bill was passed that helped put America's farmers back on the road to prosperity.

By refocusing our farm policies toward market-driven programs, American agriculture became internationally competitive once again, reclaiming lost markets and lost income. The artificially high loan rates of the 1981 bill were decreased and a host of other changes were made to reflect a market-oriented farm economy. Those changes also reflected a new international orientation, a realization that we must compete in a global marketplace. The results speak for themselves. The Food Security

Act of 1985 helped build farm exports from \$26 billion up to \$40 billion, reduced carry-over stocks, raised net farm income to new record highs, reduced farmers' debt loads, and eventually pared Government farm support costs from \$26 billion to \$8 billion.

Well folks, it's election year, and guess what? Better bring in the cattle and lock the tractors in the barn, 'cause the politicians are on the prowl, and a lot of them are looking for politically expedient, short term solutions to whatever problems they think you have.

BACK TO THE FUTURE

Why else would Congress even entertain the idea of returning to the failed policies of the 1981 Farm Bill, much less write these same policies into a farm bill for the 1990's?

Why else would Congress think that, five short years after near-catastrophe, they can manipulate loan rates without affecting America's export competitiveness?

Why else would Congress, even after hearing America's farmers tell them to leave the Farm Bill alone, produce a 1,600 page document wrought with changes?

And the gall of it all, the one thing American farmers have asked for, planting flexibility, Congress refuses to grant. What's going on? Does Congress think that farmers can't remember ten, even five short years ago?

Well, farmers do remember. They have vivid memories because they pay the price for short sighted, wrong headed policies.

Do they think America's farmers will sell America's agricultural soul for an increase in loan rates? Well, they won't, unless that result is foisted on them by the Congress. Farmers know better.

A HORSE IS A HORSE * * *

Congress is betting that the farm community will follow the adage of not looking a gift horse in the mouth. I think they're making a big mistake.

Farmers are not a bunch of country bumpkins, and this is one gift horse America's farmers will look in the mouth. When they do, they're going to see a Trojan horse in our midst, with a belly full of malodorous policy cadavers left over from the pre-'85 farm bill, cadavers which haven't seen the light of day for five years, but which Congress proposes to turn loose to run amuck in our farm sector, convinced the results will be much better, this time. I suppose that could be called optimism.

All this is a shame, because Congress and the Administration worked hard to get a very good farm bill on the books in '85, and we can do the same in 1990, regardless of the partisan shrill of some members of Congress who claim the Administration hasn't come forward with sufficient guidance for a 1990 Farm Bill.

Nothing could be further from the truth. It wasn't that the Congress had no guidance from the Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture. They simply chose to ignore much of that guidance, and to ignore much of the input they got from farmers themselves.

RED MEANS STOP, GREEN MEANS GO

After talking with America's farmers, farm organizations, commodity groups, agribusiness and industry representatives, the academic community, and members of Congress, we published a book back in February that spells out in great detail the Administration's proposals for continuing the successful course set in the 1985 legislation.

We call it our "Green Book," our "go" book, because it is filled with workable,

proven policies—all of them building on the successes of the 1985 Act, while avoiding the mistakes of 1981. Though time won't allow me to review all of these proposals with you today—the Green Book consists of more than 145 pages worth of very specific policy recommendations—I would like to mention a few of the more obvious areas where important differences between the Administration and Congress still exist.

Dairy: The proposed legislation provides a rigid price floor of \$10.00/cwt. and provisions which are certain to bring production quotas or other draconian supply control measures as surpluses build up at the fixed floor price. This combination is ill-conceived and self-destructive. It will clearly lead us down a path to gigantic surpluses, and is designed to place the cost burden of those surpluses on the backs of the American consumers.

Dairy farmers are already beginning to expand production, even before these provisions become law! California milk production in July was up 8 percent from a year earlier, and the whole country's was up 5 percent. Expansion is encouraged by the price floor, and even more so by the expectation that supply controls will be introduced when surpluses arise. Producers are beginning a "race for base" in anticipation of regulated quotas limiting their domestic marketing. If the legislation passes in its present form, we'll be well on our way to creating a permanent regulatory apparatus for U.S. dairy production.

These provisions are the antithesis of market principles, diametrically contrary to the progress and principle of the 1985 Farm Bill, and must be changed. Such retrogression is not acceptable. Our export oriented industries—corn, soybeans, cotton, rice, wheat, cattle, hogs, and others—should pay close attention to what the Congress does on this issue. Passage of this pending dairy legislation could demolish their opportunities for opening up additional export markets.

Loan Rates and Acreage Reduction Programs (ARPS): Though these are separate issues, the policy consequences are nearly identical, so I'll treat them together.

Whenever prices trend downward, as they have on wheat in recent weeks, there is always a temptation for Congress to raise loan rates, take land out of production, or both. The latter presumably will raise prices by reducing supplies in future years, and the former provides a price floor for products that farmers have not yet sold. These are politically expedient moves, and they provide at least some short term benefits to farmers.

But we must have a longer term view than that, or we'll discover that we've helped ourselves in the short run while shooting ourselves in the foot in the long run. That is precisely what we did in the early 1980s and we all know the results. Higher price floors led to a huge accumulation of surpluses, our export collapsed, farm incomes plummeted, land values deteriorated, and thousands of farmers went out of business. All this while government thought it was helping!

We simply must learn that higher loan rates may provide a more attractive safety net for our producers, but they also provide a similarly attractive price umbrella for our competitors. The impact of the latter often overwhelms the former, and that gets us all in trouble. Our price umbrella stimulates a production response in competitor nations, and those additional supplies come back to haunt us on the world market. We've re-

peated that unfortunate experience on numerous occasions over the past half century and loan rates higher than those provided for in current law should be rejected out-of-hand.

Encouraging higher ARPs, or other schemes to take land out of production, has the same effect. Why do you suppose negotiators from other countries are clamoring in the Uruguay Round for the United States to sustain or increase its set-aside acreage? Not because they're interested in our farm incomes, I assure you. It is because they are interested in their farm incomes! They know that if we'll "unilaterally disarm" by pulling additional land out of production, that makes us less competitive and gives them a golden opportunity to increase market share. We cut back our production; they increase theirs. A good deal if you can get it—for them! We did that to ourselves just a few years ago, and we've been paying for that mistake ever since. I'm going to do everything in my power to avoid that result now, and that means we're going to have to change a number of ARP provisions in the 1990 Farm Bill.

Flexibility: Every farmer I've talked to since becoming Secretary of Agriculture would like more flexibility in his operations. Every farmer I've talked to would like to see farm programs simplified. Every farmer I've talked to would like to make more of his own decisions, and have fewer decisions imposed upon him by the federal government.

So what does Congress do? It passes a 1,600-page piece of legislation that goes in precisely the opposite direction! Why would Congress do such a thing—seemingly contrary to the wishes of its own constituency? Everyone is entitled to his own analysis of that phenomenon, but my view is that Congress does not want farmers to make their own decisions. Political power comes from having those decisions centered in Washington, D.C., and Congress likes power. The same analysis applies to farm organizations. Their survivability and their staff jobs depend on political activity here in Washington. Putting decisions in farmers' hands makes Congress and farm organizations less relevant. Hence, there is a strong self-interest motivation on the part of many members of Congress and many farm organizations to make farm programs rigid and complex, rather than simple and flexible.

Who pays the price? The farmer, of course. And the environment, for rigid, inflexible farm programs clearly bring about more environmental degradation than would otherwise be the case. It is ironic that environmental groups paid little attention to the flexibility issue during the farm bill debates, even though the Administration's flexibility proposal would probably do more for environmental protection than all the rest of the bill's environmental provisions combined.

Is this situation reparable? Not entirely at this late date, but the conferees could still make a number of changes that would significantly enhance flexibility. Let's hope that farmers, environmentalists, and the Administration can, over the next two weeks, build a persuasive case of doing that.

Target Prices/Deficiency Payments: Earlier this year, some members of the Agriculture Committees criticized me for being unwilling to specify the Administration's target price objectives. They wanted those numbers as 1990 campaign fodder, of course! So there were sound political reasons for us not to provide them at that time. But I also pointed out that budget constraints would

determine the level of income supports for American agriculture, and that we did not then know what those constraints would be. As of today, we still don't know, for Congress and the Administration have not yet reached agreement at the Budget Summit. Hopefully, they will do so within the next few days.

It is possible that a summit agreement will provide the target price/payment base parameters for U.S. agricultural policy over the next five years. If not that specific, the agreement will provide a budget sum, and the task of allocating that sum will go to the farm bill conferees. We will offer our views in that proceeding.

The choice will be to adjust target prices, payment bases, or a combination of the two, crop by crop. Congress and the Administration must try to work this out in a way that will be fair and equitable, and advantageous to American agriculture as a whole.

Sugar: American sugar policy has some of the same shortcomings as our dairy regime. Somebody pays, and the policy debate is over whether that should be the taxpayer, the consumer, or a combination of the two. In recent years that burden has been entirely on the consumer, because present legislation calls for the program to operate at no cost to the taxpayer.

That foundation is now very shaky. With a price support of \$0.18/lb., sugar production in the United States has expanded, and import quotas have had to be reduced in order to avoid forfeitures of sugar to the government.

Crunch time is coming, and the answer of our sugar industry has been to add to the 1990 Farm Bill provisions for a stand-by program of marketing allotments. What this means is that we're about to create another program where the government will artificially shrink supply in order to protect the taxpayer. What is not mentioned is that this will zap the consumer even more at the present.

Our view at the beginning of the farm bill debate was that Congress should simply not tamper with the sugar program in 1990, but should await changes that would be negotiated in the Uruguay Round. In other words, we and other sugar producing nations should go down the reform road together. I still believe that makes the most sense. The House, however, could not resist the temptation to change the program. In our judgment, they made it worse, and that needs to be corrected in conference. If we're going to change it, let's make it better! Movement to less market orientation via supply management is something that should not be accepted.

Marketing Loans for Oilseeds: Our soybean producers have pushed hard this year for some kind of legislation to give them a boost in the international marketplace. My personal view is that the proper way to do this would be through a target price/deficiency payment program, similar to the one that has long been in place for feed grains and wheat. But budget considerations made that impractical, so oilseed producers turned to the marketing loan framework as an alternative.

Unfortunately, there is major budget exposure in this proposed program, and that will have to be considered during the conference committee deliberations. The Congressional Budget Office does not now recognize that exposure, but that could change as this process evolves.

In addition, this program creates at least five or six new program crops—sunflowers,

safflower, flaxseed, rapeseed, canola, and mustard seed. Market loans for these threaten to become an administrative nightmare. For some of these crops, a good data base on either U.S. or international prices does not now exist. It is an impossible task for the Department to administer programs for which the underlying data is not available. Such a situation is bound to generate inequities and distortions. How do we mesh U.S. and world market prices to make us competitive in an oilseed where there is no world market?

Conferees should look very closely at this entire proposal before we get ourselves in a position that might do oilseed producers more harm than good.

Studies: Whenever Congress discovers an issue for which legislation would be premature, or one that is just too hot to handle legislatively, the response is to ask someone to study it. That someone is usually the Department. The 1990 Farm Bill calls for over 100 studies, surveys and reports to be done on a variety of issues from Canadian alfalfa seed exports to composting.

We don't mind doing studies, and we believe we do them well. But over 100 of them? That takes a lot of time, money and manpower. The conferees ought to jettison the low-priority studies, or give me the privilege of doing so, and let us get on with administering our many programs.

Micromanagement: Finally, as a nation we legislate ourselves too much these days. We cannot solve all the problems of the world—or even of U.S. agriculture—in Congress. A lot of these alleged or perceived problems ought to be handled by the private sector, and legislative bodies ought to keep their hands off. And those which do demand a legislative solution can often be dealt with at lower levels of government. We seem to be returning to a trend of trying to solve problems in Washington, D.C., rather than locally, and of solving problems by regulating everything and everybody. That is a trend that was resisted ferociously, and with considerable success, by the Reagan administration, but it has now come back to challenge the Bush administration. We intend also to resist Congress' tendency to micromanage and over-regulate, but we'll need the help of the American public in doing so.

The 1990 Farm Bill has plenty of examples of Congressional micromanagement. We do not need a 1,600-page farm bill! It encompasses too much government, too much direction to farmers, too much regulation, too much infringement in people's lives.

We ought to be able to do better. And we can do better; 1985 proved that. The question today is, will we? Have we learned from the past, from the mistakes of 1981, or, as the adage goes, are we doomed to repeat them?

BACK TO THE FUTURE—AG-STYLE

The premise that made the "Back to the Future" movies so enthralling was the ability of the good guys, as well as the not-so-good guys, to jump aboard an old DeLorean time-travel machine and blast back and forth from past to future, gaining a first hand account of the cause-and-effect of seemingly insignificant individual actions.

I've often thought that if I had a time-travel tractor and could take members of Congress "back to the future," they wouldn't be as eager to resurrect some of the ill-conceived portions of their dead-and-buried farm bill of 1981 as they seem to be.

But I'm always an optimist. And I'm still confident that clearer visions will ultimately prevail in the halls of Congress, and they

will listen to what America's farmers, and the Bush administration, are trying to tell them: Please, we've lived through the past, and we've seen the future. The past can indeed be a prologue for the 1990 Farm Bill, but the future of America's farmers should be based not on the tragedy of 1981, but on the triumph of 1985.

Let's build on past successes, not past mistakes. Call your representatives and tell them to build on '85, not return to '81. Or, just tell them "green means go."

We'll make sure they know what you're talking about.

□ 1220

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

The vote on S. 3033, if postponed, will occur at the end of debate on all suspensions, but no earlier than 4 p.m. The vote on the remaining suspension bills will be postponed until tomorrow.

THE 1992 OLYMPIC COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4962) to authorize the minting of commemorative coins to support the training of American athletes participating in the 1992 Olympic Games, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4962

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "1992 Olympic Commemorative Coin Act".

SEC. 2. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) FIVE DOLLAR GOLD COINS.—

(1) ISSUANCE.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall issue not more than 500,000 \$5 coins which shall weigh 8.359 grams, have a diameter of 0.850 inches, and shall contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) DESIGN.—The design of such \$5 coins shall be emblematic of the participation of American athletes in the 1992 Olympic Games. On each such coin there shall be a designation of the value of the coin, an in-

scription of the year "1992", and inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(b) ONE DOLLAR SILVER COINS.—

(1) ISSUANCE.—The Secretary shall issue not more than 4,000,000 \$1 coins which shall weigh 26.73 grams, have a diameter of 1.500 inches, and shall contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(2) DESIGN.—The design of the \$1 coins shall be emblematic of the participation of American athletes in the 1992 Olympic Games. On each such coin there shall be a designation of the value of the coin, an inscription of the year "1992", and inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(c) HALF DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—

(1) ISSUANCE.—The Secretary shall issue not more than 6,000,000 half dollar coins each of which shall—

(A) weigh 11.34 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and

(C) be minted to the specifications for half dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(2) DESIGN.—The design of the half dollar coins shall be emblematic of the participation of American athletes in the 1992 Olympic Games. Each half dollar coin shall bear a designation of the value of the coin, an inscription of the year "1992", and inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(d) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins issued under this Act shall be legal tender as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 3. SOURCES OF BULLION.

(a) SILVER BULLION.—The Secretary shall obtain silver for the coins minted under this Act only from stockpiles established under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

(b) GOLD BULLION.—The Secretary shall obtain gold for the coins minted under this Act pursuant to the authority of the Secretary under existing law.

SEC. 4. SELECTION OF DESIGN.

The design for each coin authorized by this Act shall be selected by the Secretary after consultation with the United States Olympic Committee and the Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 5. SALE OF THE COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the face value, plus the cost of designing and issuing such coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS AT A DISCOUNT.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins prior to the issuance of such coins. Sales under this subsection shall be at a reasonable discount.

(d) SURCHARGE REQUIRED.—All sales shall include a surcharge of \$35 per coin for the \$5 coins, \$7 per coin for the \$1 coins, and \$1 per coin for the half dollar coins.

SEC. 6. ISSUANCE OF THE COINS.

(a) GOLD COINS.—The \$5 coins authorized under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities and shall be struck at the United States Bullion Depository at West Point.

(b) SILVER AND HALF DOLLAR COINS.—The \$1 coins and the half dollar coins authorized

under this Act may be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities, except that not more than 1 facility of the Bureau of the Mint may be used to strike any particular combination of denomination and quality.

(c) SUNSET PROVISION.—No coins shall be minted under this Act after June 30, 1993.

SEC. 7. GENERAL WAIVER OF PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS.

No provision of law governing procurement or public contracts shall be applicable to the procurement of goods or services necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act. Nothing in this section shall relieve any person entering into a contract under the authority of this Act from complying with any law relating to equal employment opportunity.

SEC. 8. DISTRIBUTION OF SURCHARGES.

All surcharges which are received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the United States Olympic Committee. Such amounts shall be used by the United States Olympic Committee for the objects and purposes of the committee as established in the Amateur Sports Act of 1978.

SEC. 9. AUDITS.

The Comptroller General shall have the right to examine such books, records, documents, and other data of the United States Olympic Committee as may be related to the expenditure of amounts paid under section 8.

SEC. 10. COINAGE PROFIT FUND.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) all amounts received from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be deposited in the coinage profit fund;

(2) the Secretary shall pay the amounts authorized under this Act from the coinage profit fund; and

(3) the Secretary shall charge the coinage profit fund with all expenditures under this Act.

SEC. 11. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

(a) NO NET COST TO THE GOVERNMENT.—The Secretary shall take all actions necessary to ensure that the issuance of the coins authorized by this Act shall result in no net cost to the United States Government.

(b) ADEQUATE SECURITY FOR PAYMENT REQUIRED.—No coin shall be issued under this Act unless the Secretary has received—

(1) full payment therefor;

(2) security satisfactory to the Secretary to indemnify the United States for full payment; or

(3) a guarantee of full payment satisfactory to the Secretary from a depository institution whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the National Credit Union Administration Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 4962, authorizes the minting of gold, silver and clad coins to honor the participation of American athletes in the 1992 Olympic Games. This legislation, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Mr. HILER, would provide much needed funds for the training of Olympic athletes—and these funds would be raised at no net cost to the Government and the American taxpayer. The first Olympic Commemorative Program, in 1984 raised over \$73 million for the Olympic effort and the second program of 1988, which got off to a late start, raised almost \$23 million.

The funds that these two congressionally authorized programs have provided have been critical to the success of the American Olympic effort—and I am certain that this legislation, if approved, will go a long way to help American athletes achieve their greatest potential.

I know that all of us have been inspired by the sacrifice, dedication, and discipline of the athletes who strive to participate in the Olympic games. The financial and personal sacrifices made by these individuals are almost impossible for many of us to comprehend. Today, however we have the opportunity to pass legislation which might make the financial burden of training for the Olympics a little easier to bear, or which could help support athletes who might not otherwise be able to afford to train for the Olympics.

In testimony given before the house banking subcommittee on consumer affairs and coinage, athlete after athlete told of the difference that financial aid, provided from the sales of 1988 Olympic coins, had made to their success and even their world ranking.

The Olympics has always produced heroes and positive role models for young Americans, and I think now more than ever what our country needs is more positive role models. This legislation is an opportunity to give something to those who have been an inspiration to so many—to help sponsor those who will inspire young Americans to strive for great achievement.

Mr. Speaker, the two previous Olympic coin programs were passed near unanimously by Congress, and this bill has the support of over 230 cosponsors in the House. The bill was amended in subcommittee making a few minor changes to address concerns of the mint, as well as to add a clad coin to the commemorative series. The clad coin provides an affordable alternative to the gold and silver coins and has been a component of most major coin programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial bill that has bipartisan support.

The amended bill was reported by the consumer affairs and coinage subcommittee without dissent. I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise in strong support of H.R. 4962, the 1992 Olympic Commemorative Coin Act. I want to commend the sponsors of this bill, Consumer Affairs and Coinage Committee Subcommittee Chairman LEHMAN and ranking member HILER for the fine work they have done in order to conform H.R. 4962 to subcommittee rules and to bring this legislation to the House floor and to the Chairman for his expeditious manner.

This is the third Olympic Coin program that Congress has authorized. As the Chairman mentioned, in 1984 the first Olympic Commemorative Coin program raised \$73 million for our athletes and in 1988 the program raised \$22 million. We must recognize that U.S. athletes are the only athletes in the world who are not supported directly by their government. This government sponsored coin program is the only device that we may use to support our athletes. I am hopeful that the 1992 program will be extremely successful in helping our athletes overcome personal financial sacrifices to represent our country in the games.

I would briefly like to summarize the key provisions of the bill. Section 2 authorizes the minting of up to 500,000 gold coins, 4 million silver coins and 6 million clad coins. The coins would commemorate the participation of the athletes in the 1992 games.

Section 4 specifies that the design of the coins shall be selected by the Secretary of the Treasury after consultation with the U.S. Olympic Committee and the U.S. Commission on Fine Arts.

Section 5 requires that the coins would be sold directly to the public and would carry a surcharge of \$35 on the gold coins; \$7 on the silver coins; and \$1 on the clad coins.

Section 8 requires that the surcharges be promptly paid to the U.S. Olympic Committee.

Section 9 permits the GAO to audit the U.S. Olympic Committee concerning the coin program and Section 10 of the bill requires that the coins be minted at no net cost to the government.

I am optimistic that the 1992 Olympic Coin program may be as successful as our initial program in 1984. I must admit that Subcommittee members are somewhat disappointed at the results of the 1988 program which fell far short of the moneys raised in 1984. Several reasons have been offered for this shortfall. I am hopeful that by enacting this legislation two full years

before the games that the Mint will have sufficient lead time to better prepare its marketing programs in 1992.

Additionally, I believe greater cooperation by the U.S. Olympic Committee with the Mint is necessary to ensure that we improve upon the 1988 program. Our subcommittee will be looking very closely at the operation of the 1992 program, particularly the level of cooperation that the U.S. Olympic Committee is giving the Mint. Greater cooperation is essential to future programs and will only benefit the athletes.

In closing, let me say that I strongly support H.R. 4962. The 1992 Olympic Commemorative Coin Act will help our athletes who desperately need funds to train in order to represent our country. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure and to promptly pass this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McMILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the U.S. Olympic Team. As our Olympians prepare for the upcoming games it is necessary for us to provide crucial financial support to aid our athletes in their quest to become the "best athletes in the world."

Mr. Speaker, the United States remains the only nation that does not provide direct funding to our Olympic athletes. In fact, through our television networks the American consumer not only is the major financial contributor to the production of the games, but financially supports the training of foreign athletes as well. Members may be interested to know that while the ABC network paid \$309 million for the rights to the 1988 winter games, 95 percent of the total that the International Olympic Committee [IOC] raised from all the worldwide broadcasting rights, U.S. Athletes only received a miniscule 2.5 percent of that amount. The rest of the funds went to the IOC, the Calgary Organizing Committee, and to the Olympic committees of other nations.

In the United States our private sector plays the greatest role in providing financial assistance to our Olympians. This is how it should be. However, sometimes we need to supplement this aid. H.R. 4962, the Olympic Coin Act, will help us to do that, as it did in 1984 and 1988, but at no cost to the taxpayer.

This act will provide crucial revenues to propel our athletes further along the road to excellence. How do revenues from Olympic coins aid the performance of our athletes?

By extending grants to individual athletes to offset the high costs of training, by defraying tuition costs for athletes in degree programs, by enabling athletes who work to gain time-off for vital training, and by filling the variety of other needs that surface as individuals follow the route to the Olympic games.

The correlation between financial assistance programs and positive gains in performance by athletes is impressive; 100 percent of U.S. Athletes surveyed maintained that this assistance helps to improve performance, while 98 percent said that the U.S. Olympic Committee [USOC] programs have translated

into demonstrable performance gains in this year alone.

Important as they are, financial assistance programs comprise only one target for Olympic Coin Act revenues. The others are equally noteworthy and essential for the success of the U.S. Olympic Team; grassroots programs, elimination of steroid drug-use in sports, and the replacement and improvement of training equipment and facilities at Olympic training centers.

To persevere through intensely rigorous trails and training, and indeed to become the best in the world, is a noble aspiration that the American people cannot afford to leave unfulfilled. Representing the United States in the Olympic games is an honor cherished by our athletes. By supporting this Olympic Coin Act, the U.S. Congress can help to ensure that American athletes will continue to win the highest marks in the world.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4962, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on H.R. 4962, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEPOSIT INSURANCE FUNDS PROTECTION ACT OF 1990

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5610) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to remove the caps imposed on deposit insurance premiums and annual premium increases, to allow the assessment rates to be adjusted more frequently than annually, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5610

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Deposit Insurance Funds Protection Act of 1990".

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF CEILINGS ON INSURANCE PREMIUMS AND ANNUAL PREMIUM INCREASES.

(a) BANK INSURANCE FUND.—Clause (iv) of section 7(b)(1)(C) of the Federal Deposit In-

insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(b)(1)(C)) is amended by striking "and capitalization, except that—" and all that follows through the end of such clause and inserting "and capitalization; and".

(b) SAVINGS ASSOCIATION INSURANCE FUND.—Clause (v) of section 7(b)(1)(D) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(b)(1)(D)) is amended by striking "and capitalization, except that—" and all that follows through the end of such clause and inserting "and capitalization; and".

SEC. 3. FDIC AUTHORITY TO ADJUST ASSESSMENT RATES MORE FREQUENTLY THAN ANNUALLY.

(a) BANK INSURANCE FUND.—Section 7(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(b)(1)(A)) is amended—

(i) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following new clause:

"(i) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH RATES.—The Corporation shall set assessment rates for insured depository institutions at such times as the Corporation, in the sole discretion of the Corporation, determines to be appropriate."; and

(2) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following new clause:

"(iii) ANNOUNCEMENT OF RATE CHANGES.—If the Corporation changes the assessment rate, the Corporation shall provide public notice of such change on or before the beginning of the 60-day period ending on the date such change takes effect."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 7(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(b)(1)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking "annual".

(2) Section 7(b)(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(b)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C)(iv) (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act)—

(i) by striking "on January 1 of a calendar year" and inserting "for any period"; and

(ii) by inserting "in the sole discretion of such board," after "rate determined by the Board of Directors"; and

(B) in subparagraph (D)(v) (as amended by section 2(b) of this Act)—

(i) by striking "on January 1 of a calendar year" and inserting "for any period"; and

(ii) by inserting "in the sole discretion of such board," after "rate determined by the Board of Directors".

(3) Section 7(d)(1)(A) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(d)(1)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking "By September 30 of each calendar year," and inserting "Before the beginning of the 60-day period ending on the 1st day of each semiannual period."; and

(B) by striking "the succeeding calendar year" and inserting "such semiannual period".

(4) Section 7(d)(2) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(d)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "in the coming year" and inserting "in the coming semiannual period"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B),

(i) by striking "succeeding year" each place such term appears and inserting "succeeding semiannual period"; and

(ii) by striking "succeeding calendar year" and inserting "succeeding semiannual period".

(5) Section 7(d)(3) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(d)(3)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "in the coming year" and inserting "in the coming semiannual period"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B),

(i) by striking "succeeding year" each place such term appears and inserting "succeeding semiannual period"; and

(ii) by striking "succeeding calendar year" and inserting "succeeding semiannual period".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for many years, I have been concerned about the health of the deposit insurance funds. Although the focus has most recently been on losses to the savings and loan insurance fund, I know that in my home State of Texas more banks than thrifts have failed. Information revealed in recent hearings of the Banking Committee and reports issued by the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office has confirmed and heightened my concerns. Thirty-one of my colleagues on the Banking Committee are cosponsors of the legislation I present today.

The bank insurance fund, or BIF is facing a fifth consecutive year of multibillion dollar losses. Its net worth is down to \$11 billion and its reserve level is at less than half the amount required for minimum safety. The financial condition of the fund will almost certainly continue to deteriorate as the bank industry's condition declines along with the economy. The General Accounting Office now estimates that the BIF may lose up to \$6.3 billion next year based on its projections that 35 large banks are likely to fail or require assistance within the next year. Even worse, the CBO estimates that the BIF's gross spending will total about \$35 billion over the 1990-93 period and that cash balances will largely be depleted by 1995. In addition, the BIF is contingently liable for \$8 billion of troubled assets that acquirers may put back to the FDIC under deals already done.

The bank insurance fund and the savings association insurance fund or SAIF are both required to have a reserve ratio of at least \$1.25 for each \$100 insured. The SAIF basically has no reserves because it will not become operative until 1992; in the meantime the Resolution Trust Corporation is

responsible for resolving failures of savings associations. The bank insurance fund today stands at less than half of the required reserve. In fact, the bank insurance fund has lost money every year since 1983, and just since 1987, the reserve has fallen from \$1.10 per \$100 insured to 60 cents per \$100 insured with recent predictions that it will fall still further, to 50 cents.

This is in spite of the fact that bank and thrift insurance premiums were increased drastically in last year's bill, the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 [FIRREA]. Moreover, the FDIC has announced the maximum permissible premium increase for 1991—19.5 cents per \$100 insured, an increase of 7.5 cents.

Clearly, the bank insurance fund will go the way of the FSLIC unless quick action is taken to shore up the fund. The GAO has stated that the BIF's low reserve level accompanied by a recession could lead to bank failures that would exhaust the fund and require taxpayer assistance.

The purpose of H.R. 5610 is to give first aid to the deposit insurance funds. H.R. 5610 is a simple bill that provides the FDIC with the authority it needs to effect immediate improvements in the health of the deposit insurance funds.

First, H.R. 5610 gives the FDIC discretion to raise insurance premiums for banks and thrifts to whatever level the FDIC deems appropriate to restore the insurance funds to health. In determining the appropriate level, the FDIC is instructed to consider the expected operating expenses, case resolution expenditures, and investment income of the insurance fund, and the impact of the premiums on insured bank and thrift earnings and capitalization.

Second, the bill allows the FDIC to set assessment rates at such times as it deems appropriate. Rate changes must be publicly announced at least 60 days before the change becomes effective. Under current law, changes can be made only once a year and must be announced by September 30 of each year. H.R. 5610 gives the FDIC the ability to respond more quickly to changes in the conditions of the funds and institutions.

Chairman Seidman of the FDIC supports H.R. 5610 as a way to grant the FDIC needed flexibility with respect to the timing and magnitude of increases in the assessment rate.

As you know, I am currently working on a comprehensive deposit insurance reform bill, the contents of which have been described to each of you in a "Dear Colleague" circulated last week. The provisions of what is now H.R. 5610 were a part of that plan. However, given the recent revelations

concerning the deposit insurance fund's condition, it is prudent to move this bill separately and expeditiously. Senator RIEGLE has introduced similar legislation in the Senate for prompt consideration. I believe it is critical that the Congress pass this legislation before adjournment and I have every reason to believe it can be done. I ask your support.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5610, the Deposit Insurance Funds Protection Act of 1990.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I joined Chairman GONZALEZ as the original cosponsor of this legislation. I believe that this legislation is essential for maintaining a healthy balance in the FDIC's bank insurance fund [BIF]. This bill is supported by the administration because it would provide immediately "more flexibility to the FDIC to raise assessments on commercial banks to replenish the Bank Insurance Fund."

I would not characterize this legislation as emergency legislation, but I would characterize it as necessary. There is a critical difference between what we are doing now, and the savings and loan crisis. On this occasion, we are practicing an ounce of prevention—before a pound of cure is needed.

I believe that if we are to avoid a repeat of the savings and loan disaster that we must practice aggressive oversight and when danger appears on the horizon, act accordingly to keep small problems from becoming bigger problems.

Simply put, this legislation will repeal all statutory caps on the FDIC's ability to raise insurance premiums. Last year in FIRREA, we authorized the FDIC to raise premiums, but only by as much as 7.5 cents (per \$100 of insured deposits) annually. Additionally, we placed an overall cap of 32.5 cents on how high premiums could go. It is now clear to us that the FDIC needs more flexibility to structure the premiums as the need requires.

This does not necessarily mean that premiums will be raised for banks. In fact, they have just been raised to 19.5 cents by the FDIC. Chairman Seidman has indicated that he does not believe that premiums will need to go beyond this level for the time being.

Nevertheless, by raising premiums by 7.5 cents (up to 19.5) the FDIC would have to wait an entire year to raise them again. I don't want to take that chance. The FDIC needs this flexibility.

It would be irresponsible for us to allow the fund to be depleted because the restrictive cap stayed in place.

It would also be irresponsible to the taxpayers, because they stand behind the fund. The responsibility for the solvency of the fund rests primarily with the banking industry, and we should keep it that way.

The Chairman has pointed out reasons why we need this legislation.

Let me review some of the problems in the industry that have made this legislation necessary. I will caution other Members that this is not intended to be a "Chicken Little" view of the banking industry, but rather a look at the facts as they are. We don't have to scare our constituents with a negative view of the banking industry, but unlike the S&L crisis, we can't pretend that the problem does not exist by not talking about it.

The vast majority of banks are healthy and profitable, but as always a small number of troubled institutions threaten to deplete the insurance fund. In fact, the CBO estimates that one big failure could cost the fund as much as \$10 billion.

BANK EARNINGS

On July 30, I asked Chairman Seidman about the condition of the fund. He replied that it was "under considerable stress."

The fund is under stress for several reasons. First, since the enactment of FIRREA, a regional recession has been growing in the New England area. Problems with real estate are now evident in New England, New York, and there are some signs it is spreading to the Southeast. The Southwest continues to struggle under problems. The downward pressure in the real estate markets has reduced bank earnings, and as a result the FDIC fund is under a strain. In 16 States banks have an average of 3 percent or more real estate loans that are not current.

In the first 6 months of this year bank earnings were down 18.5 percent compared to 1989. This is largely as a result of loan loss reserves that are needed for poor real estate loans.

BANK FAILURES

Banks are also continuing to fail at high rates. In the first half of 1990, 99 banks have failed. Last year, 101 banks had failed during the first half. The GAO estimates that the FDIC could lose \$2 billion this year because of the continuing high rate of bank failures.

If the FDIC loses money this year, it will be the third year in a row that the fund has lost money. Although, the number of problem banks has been shrinking in the last few years, over 1,100 banks are still on the FDIC's problem bank list, nearly 9 percent of the industry. Additionally, I am concerned of course that the GAO has demonstrated that banks can fail without ever appearing on the problem bank list, or appearing for only a short time before failure.

THE FDIC FUND

Reduced earnings and bank failures have taken their toll on the FDIC. At the end of 1989, the FDIC fund had reserves of \$13.2 billion. This put the fund at its lowest reserve-to-deposit ratio ever. At the end of 1989, the fund was holding only 70 cents for every \$100 it insures. In the last 2 years, the fund has lost 28 percent of its reserves. Last year in FIRREA, we set a goal for the FDIC to have a reserve-to-deposit ratio of 1.25 percent by 1995. The prospect of the fund attaining this goal clearly is not good. In fact, under no scenario does the GAO believe the fund will reach this level without significant new premium increases.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that if we did not change the premiums from the 19.5-cent level, by 1995 the fund could only have \$12 billion remaining, with a reserve-to-deposit ratio of only 0.50 percent. This is far too low, and frankly, unacceptable.

GAO AND CBO ESTIMATES

Finally, both the GAO and the CBO have given us ample warning that the future is not necessarily brighter. Just last week the GAO released its report on the condition of the FDIC. After an exhaustive review, they believe that 35 banks with assets of \$45 billion are likely to fail in the future. Their failure will deplete the fund by \$4.4 to \$6.3 billion. Moreover, the GAO concludes that a significant number of other banks are in danger of failing over the next few years and that a recession would only heighten the dangers.

By CBO's estimate, the fund could have net losses of \$21 billion from 1990 to 1993. This would require the FDIC to use anywhere from \$35 to \$40 billion during that period. Under this scenario the fund would have a balance of \$12 billion, but a cash balance of only \$7 billion.

All of these facts point in one direction. We must start taking corrective action now. We must prevent this from becoming another S&L debacle. We must avoid repeating the mistakes of the past. The Congress' track record during the S&L crisis was not a good one; there was too much delay in taking corrective action. As the old saying goes, those who do not learn the lessons of history are doomed to repeat them. This Congress cannot let that happen.

I would urge all my colleagues to support this legislation. The Senate is considering similar legislation. The administration is supporting our efforts. I believe that we can enact this bill before we adjourn.

Finally, let me thank Chairman GONZALEZ and Subcommittee Chairman ANNUNZIO, both of whom are strongly supportive of taking action to

insure that the FDIC fund remains strong. Let me also thank those colleagues who have cosponsored this bill.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1990]
REFORM DEPOSIT INSURANCE?

Congress is now getting to work on reform of the deposit insurance system. The prevailing opinion is that deposit insurance was responsible for the enormous losses of taxpayers' money in the S&L bankruptcies and that the great lesson of that unhappy experience is the need to limit deposit insurance sharply. But before you accept that thought, you ought to consider another lesson of those bankruptcies.

While the United States has just been through an enormous wave of financial collapses, the unemployment rate has been untouched by it. In those collapses, S&Ls lost huge amounts of their depositors' money—probably well over \$150 billion—but no one has lost a job as a result of it except the people who worked directly for those S&Ls themselves. There was no cascading effect, as there was in 1933, when banks' failures destroyed businesses that were their customers. A bank's failure could wipe out its depositors, forcing them to default on their mortgages and debts, in turn throwing other banks and businesses into jeopardy.

Americans have forgotten how financial panics used to sweep through the country, turning financial failures into depressions. It hasn't happened since deposit insurance was enacted two generations ago. For all the things that went wrong in the financial world of the 1980s, the deposit insurance system worked. It prevented the S&Ls' losses from becoming contagious and spilling over into the real economy of jobs, production, sales and investment.

The system can certainly be improved, and Congress is quite right to reconsider it. The calendar for the coming months is crowded with hearings on the subject. But any reform will be dangerously misguided if it succeeds in reducing risks to the federal government only by increasing risks to depositors.

Congress has repeatedly been told that it was the deposit insurance that accounts for the tremendous costs of the S&L fiasco. Wrong. It was deposit insurance that has thrown the losses onto the federal budget rather than onto depositors. Some economists have been arguing that less deposit insurance, or none, would make both S&L managers and their depositors more prudent. That idea is more attractive in theory than in practice.

The present insurance system can be refined to the benefit of both the public and the Treasury. But the principle of deposit insurance is entirely sound. Blaming it for the S&L bankruptcies is like blaming your insurance policy for the fire that burned your house down.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 15, 1990.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

Re: H.R. 5610—Deposit Insurance Funds
Protection Act of 1990

The Administration supports legislation that would provide immediately more flexibility to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) to raise assessments on commercial banks to replenish the Bank Insurance Fund. The Administration will send a legislative proposal to Congress in the next few days.

The Administration supports passage of H.R. 5610, but will seek amendments in the Senate to conform to the Administration proposal which will provide more flexibility to the FDIC in order to strengthen the Bank Insurance Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the distinguished ranking majority member and chairman of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, I do want to point out the indispensable leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] here as the ranking minority member on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs in a leadership position.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] has been most responsive, most cooperative, and we have always tried to minimize the partisanship as much as possible. I think that this is a clear revelation of how effective that type of association does become and indispensable at critical moments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], the hard-working chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance.

□ 1240

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the accolades of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], and I want to again congratulate the chairman, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WYLIE] for the timely introduction of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation to allow the FDIC to raise its insurance premiums as it sees fit. I am a cosponsor of the bill and strongly support its goals.

Increasing the insurance premium that banks pay for their deposit insurance only a marginal effect on the state of the fund. GAO's recent report on the bank insurance fund shows that the 62-percent increase in premiums scheduled for next year will only bring in an additional \$2 billion. With GAO predicting that 35 large banks are in short-term danger of failing, the failure of even one or two could use up the entire premium increase.

Let us make no mistake about the magnitude of the problem we face. The FDIC bank insurance fund is teetering on the brink of insolvency. GAO's report last week said that the fund is too thinly capitalized to deal with potential bank failures in the event of a recession. Such an event, said the GAO, could bankrupt the fund and require a taxpayer bailout.

"Too thinly capitalized" means the fund does not have sufficient funds, now. Permitting an increase in insurance rates will not bring into the fund the billions of dollars that are needed, now. This bill will not bring the massive infusion that the fund needs, now.

And yet those who dare make the point that the fund is on the verge of bankruptcy are harshly attacked by banks and their apologists.

After I appeared on ABC's Nightline in August, I was attacked in the American Banker newspaper by former FDIC Chairman William Isaac. Mr. Isaac called me vitriolic, when I said "The FDIC is not only in bad shape, it is in horrible shape and without a massive transfusion of money, it will die very shortly and the taxpayers will have to pay for the funeral."

Now GAO has said that the fund is "too thinly capitalized" and that a recession could exhaust the fund and require a taxpayer bailout. It seems to me that GAO has said exactly what I had said.

Mr. Isaac also attacked Dr. Dan Braumbaugh, an economist hired by the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, which I chair, to study the condition of the banking system and the adequacy of the FDIC insurance fund. Mr. Isaac attacked Dr. Braumbaugh for his statement that "six large banks were very close to true insolvency." If anything, Dr. Braumbaugh was being conservative. The GAO report identified 35 large banks as likely to fail.

GAO also pointed out by name the nine money center banks that hold \$43 billion in loans to developing countries. These nine banks account for 80 percent of the total U.S. commercial bank exposure on troubled foreign loans.

Of course, Mr. Isaac has reasons for playing down the troubles facing the FDIC. He is a former Chairman of the FDIC, having served from 1981 through 1985. His tenure at the FDIC was marked by a sharp upturn in bank failures. In 1981, there were 10 bank failures, the same as in the previous 2 years. By 1985, the number of failures had jumped to 120. All and all, there were 299 bank failures during the years that Mr. Isaac was Chairman of the FDIC.

One other bank could have made that list but did not. Excluded from those numbers was Continental Illinois, a bank that was nationalized by the FDIC. It was a bank for which Mr. Isaac established the now notorious "too big to fail doctrine." This doctrine required the FDIC to cover large uninsured depositors, as well as the average citizen covered under deposit insurance limits. The policy established by Mr. Isaac led the FDIC to assume billions of dollars in liability that it otherwise had no responsibility for.

Mr. Isaac was also Chairman of the FDIC during a period in which bank regulators cut back on the number and frequency of bank examinations. That policy was followed by the FDIC even in Texas, a State beset by bank failures. By 1989, partly as a legacy of Mr. Isaac's deregulatory moves, there were

banks in Texas that had not been examined by the FDIC for more than 7 years. Even problem banks were only being visited by FDIC examiners every 19 months on average. Troubled banks were being visited by examiners only once every 23 months on average.

With a record like this, it is no wonder that the FDIC had deposit insurance losses of over \$6 billion during Mr. Isaac's tenure. In short, Mr. Isaac's legacy to the FDIC were the largest losses to that time, plus a cut-back in bank examiners just at the time they were most needed. Finally, he left the legacy of the "too big to fail" doctrine which has put the taxpayer at risk for uninsured deposits, including foreign deposits.

And what was the consequences to Mr. Isaac of his disastrous FDIC tenure? He has become a Washington consultant for banks, and spends part of his time telling the public and press what good shape the industry is in.

Last week, Mr. Isaac notwithstanding, the GAO confirmed my long-term concern that the bank insurance fund is facing a most dire crisis. To deal with the crisis, I introduced H.R. 5590, the Bank Account Safety and Soundness Act.

This bill will protect the taxpayer from any bank bailout. The legislation would require every FDIC-insured bank to put in an amount equal to 1 percent of its deposits into the fund. This would immediately produce an inflow of \$25 billion for the fund. It would immediately put the fund on a sound basis.

The GAO report points out another important reason why we must get money into the FDIC fund immediately, rather than hope that increases in insurance premiums will gradually raise enough. When the FDIC sells a bank to an acquiring bank, it often gives the acquirer a right to examine the assets of the failed bank. Any assets that the acquirer does not want, it may put back to the FDIC and receive a cash payment. These puts, the GAO points out, are "similar to the noncash transactions the Federal Savings and Loans Corporation entered into in the latter days of its existence due to the decline of its cash resources."

At the end of last year, the FDIC had approximately \$8 billion in puts outstanding. These puts resulted in an interest cost to the fund of \$1.6 billion. If the FDIC had the cash, it could have paid off these assets and avoided that cost. The fund could not do it, however, because it would have seriously impaired its liquidity.

In other words, the FDIC, for lack of funds, is being forced to act in the same manner that FSLIC acted in its last days. Let no one mistake the seriousness of the situation facing the FDIC. It is a situation that demands immediate attention. It is not a situa-

tion that we can hope for a long-term solution. There is no long term left.

Unless we act to get the FDIC the cash it needs now, it may run out of the funds it needs to deal with bank failures. In that case, it will have two choices.

It could act like the FSLIC and do the kind of costly and expensive deals that the Banking Committee heard about last week. It has already started to act like the FSLIC. In 1988, it hired private lobbyists to help pass certain tax breaks for acquirers of failed banks. It used those provisions to shift \$700 million in costs to the taxpayers by giving the acquirers the tax breaks as part of its deals. This is exactly what the FSLIC did. Also, as I indicated earlier, its puts are similar to deals that the FSLIC did with acquirers of failed savings and loans because of its liquidity problems.

FDIC's second option is to ask the taxpayers to pay. That is what the FSLIC finally did, to the tune of \$500 billion over the next 40 years.

The Bank Safety and Soundness Act is a way to avoid both alternatives.

The legislation would produce an immediate inflow of \$25 billion to the bank insurance fund. If nothing more, this would provide the immediate liquidity that the FDIC will need to meet its cash demands from the outstanding puts. In addition, it will provide the FDIC with funds which would enable it to reduce the cost of carrying those puts.

The legislation would result in the FDIC having an immediate reserve ratio of 1.7 percent. This ratio would be the highest in the history of the FDIC. It would be consistent with the GAO suggestion that Congress and the FDIC consider higher reserve ratios than the currently mandated target of 1.25 percent.

The BASS Act would further require that any time the Bank Insurance Fund fell below 1 percent of reserves, there would be a call upon all banks to make additional deposits into the fund to bring the fund back into the 1-percent level. This would make certain that the taxpayers would be protected from any bailout, since the banks themselves would have to make up any shortfall in the deposit fund.

It is banks who benefit from deposit insurance. Depositors are protected, but the banks get the benefit of being able to attract depositors at lower interest rates. Therefore, it is the banks that should stand behind the deposit insurance fund. The BASS Act, by making them put an amount equal to 1 percent of their deposits into the bank insurance fund, forces them to do so.

The savings and loan crisis has shown that the taxpayers have been called on too much to bail out financial institutions. Last year, Secretary Brady testified over and over again

that "never again should we permit another financial institution crisis." I say never again should the taxpayer be called upon to bail out financial institutions.

To deal with that situation, I have scheduled hearings on the BASS Act for September 27. I hope we can pass it before Congress adjourns. We cannot risk having the FDIC go bankrupt because of one or two large bank failures while Congress is adjourned.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5610. I come to the House floor today to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] and the ranking Republican, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WYLIE] on their decision in leadership to bring this before Members today.

The fact is that an action to raise insurance premiums in any set of circumstances is never going to be popular in the short term. So it does take considerable courage for these two gentlemen to bring this bill to the House floor to increase insurance premiums. But the fact is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WYLIE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] understand that insurance premiums have to be set based on the size of the underwriting losses, not based on how much we wish the underwriting losses could or should be.

It is true that the Congress will and should act to reduce those losses in the future. However, so long as those losses continue, we should have the FDIC set the insurance premiums for this fund in a way designed to pay the total cost of the underwriting losses, plus provide a considerable cushion for emergencies that may happen in the future.

The banking system cannot be said to be following the same path of the Nation's thrifts in recent years, because in part of this legislation. The banking system has fallen on harder times, and more failures caused by weak real estate portfolios and a slowing overall economy. Those factors placed on the bank insurance fund in a moderate degree of jeopardy. Quick action by Congress, quick action by the Committee on Banking in this instance, and by the regulators, will forestall any further weakening of the funds.

The bill gives the FDIC the power to keep the insurance premium fund solid by removing limits on the premiums. Clearly, long-term changes are necessary. Congress will examine the role of foreign deposits, which are exempt from paying premiums, but are largely, nevertheless, "insured" by the FDIC under the old, and I think outdated, too big to fail doctrine, and

the Congress will have to examine and reform the underlying framework of deposit insurance to remove the incentives that encourage risky behavior by financial institutions. That is because simply raising premiums in the aggregate hurt innocent institutions that have managed their portfolios prudently. Innocent institutions are paying a deposit subsidy on those who took too much risk.

Those actions show courage and foresight by the Committee on Banking leadership, and I support their actions in this very significant and important legislation.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5610, the FDIC Insurance Premium Act. As a cosponsor of the measure, I believe that it is important that Congress act on this proposal in a timely manner. I am deeply concerned about the condition of the FDIC fund and the health of our nation's banking system.

H.R. 5610 is a responsible step in meeting the growing difficulties facing banks, the FDIC, and the bank insurance fund. Clearly many banks and the bank insurance fund are currently at risk. The downturn in the economy, depressed real estate markets in the Northeast added to flat markets of the Southwest, growing business failures, questionable appraisal practices, and the debatable value of troubled bank assets being managed by caretaker institutions all add up to deep concerns. While the current situation may not be another S&L crisis, it is imperative that we keep in place the tools for the regulators before the problem gets out of control.

H.R. 5610 gives the regulators the authority to increase premiums for both the bank insurance fund and the savings association insurance fund. This authority will permit the regulators to respond to the current and future shortages in the insurance fund through additional premium increases.

While H.R. 5610 does provide some relief, it should be properly recognized as only one needed step. With the adoption of FIRREA during the first session, Congress did implement other crucial changes to strengthen the regulators' authority and the insurance funds. In addition, Congress and the administration must come to grips with comprehensive insurance reforms. I am pleased that the House Banking Committee and the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions have begun to lay the groundwork for prompt action on this issue early next year. The proposal raised by my colleague, Chairman GONZALEZ, has many positive concepts that should be incor-

porated into any final reforms which Congress does enact.

While most experts say that the current problems facing the bank fund do not indicate that another S&L crisis is imminent, I am deeply concerned that, like the old S&L regulators, bank regulators are on the slippery slope of explaining away the severity of the problem and suggesting that more, new bank powers are a panacea for today's weak bank health. Congressional refusal to act on new bank powers should certainly not be taken as approval of granting such powers. Regulatory actions, such as expanding activities covered by the insurance fund or permitting expanded bank roles with common trust funds, may well put the bank insurance fund at even greater risk without proper deliberations of safeguards. For the regulators to disregard existing law and to continue to grant new or expanded powers ignores the painful lessons of the administration's S&L slip shod regulation policies of the 1980's. Serious problems remain concerning how sound the FDIC's \$13.2 billion fund is. Importantly, \$8 billion of this fund is in assets which the GAO questions. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed about the complaints coming from some in the financial institutions community about the burden of regulation and their suggestion that in hard times, the regulators should be more understanding and flexible. This approach is a repackaged forbearance argument that contributed mightily to the S&L debacle of this decade. Forbearance did not work for the S&L's and it will not work for banks. Neither Congress nor the administration should pay any attention to this litany of pleas. Forbearance directly contributed to the increased costs of the S&L bailout and would certainly further exacerbate the current stress on the bank insurance fund.

Ensuring the stability of the bank insurance fund and the competitive role of banks in our economy will not be accomplished overnight. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5610 as a step in that process.

Nearly \$500 million are managed by other banks for the FDIC and may be over valued by 15 percent. One large money center bank could wipe out the FDIC fund according to the GAO and 35 money center banks have serious problems, according to GAO. In 1989 the FDIC fund has only seven-tenths of a percent reserves for each \$100 deposit and with further losses in 1990 today will slip further.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, to take this additional time to express my sincere thanks to the chairman of the Committee on Banking for his complimentary statement with reference to my role in his bill and this legislation. I return the compliment by

saying that as the ranking majority member of the Committee on Banking over the last several years, if we had listened to the gentleman from Texas we could have avoided a lot of taxpayer liability as far as savings and loan crisis is concerned. Now, as the chairman and leader of the Committee on Banking, he has acted promptly to prevent, and I use the word "prevent" advisedly, prevent further taxpayer liability in the area of deposit insurance. We do thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. Speaker, this is an ounce of cure. This is preventive medicine. We are only acting early and decisively to deal with a problem that may come up. We have ample warnings from the FDIC and GAO and the CBO that there may be problems. We have the support of the administration, the FDIC, the chairman, and Bill Seidman says he needs this flexibility. It is a good measure that I believe we should pass before Congress adjourns this session.

□ 1240

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARNARD].

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Deposit Insurance Funds Protection Act of 1990. When Congress passed FIRREA in August of 1989, it was intended that the bank insurance fund achieve a reserve balance of \$1.25 for every \$100 of deposits. From all available projections, this will not be possible. The fund's reserves have decreased by 28 percent over the past 2 years with loss projections for this year running as high as \$2 billion. It is now at an all time low of 70 cents for every \$100 of deposits. If the economy enters a recession for any length of time, the stress on the fund could be even more severe.

It is vital that the insurance fund have enough cash on hand in order to promptly and decisively deal with problem banks. One of the many factors that greatly increased the losses in the S&L industry was the fact that the FSLIC fund did not have enough money to promptly or properly close institutions. Institutions remained open and raised costs for other institutions by paying high rates to attract deposits. When we finally did get around to closing these institutions, costs had risen significantly or else the only alternatives for resolution were in the long run more costly to the Government.

The FDIC is presently limited under FIRREA to a maximum premium assessment of 0.15 cents per \$100 of deposits. H.R. 5610 gives the FDIC the discretion to increase the premium assessment as needed although it is gen-

erally agreed that there is a practical limit on the amount of increase that banks can sustain. According to the CBO and other sources, that limit is about 19.5 cents per \$100 of deposits, after which the negative impact on the profitability of insured institutions outweighs the benefits to the funds.

An increase of this magnitude will significantly benefit the fund and assist it in promptly resolving failed institutions. H.R. 5610 is an excellent first step, but more needs to be done, and quickly. Our next step must be to find a way to restructure the industry to attract more private capital so that taxpayers' capital will never again be at risk. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in taking this first step toward a healthier insurance fund.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, with some reluctance I rise in support of H.R. 5610, the Deposit Insurance Funds Protection Act of 1990. In the wake of the biggest taxpayer bailout in our financial history and on the eve of an increasingly likely recession, banking regulators should have maximum discretion in protecting the deposit insurance fund. Their hands should not be tied by statutorily imposed premium caps.

But it should be understood that while raising insurance premiums provides new resources to the fund, it also weakens the competitive position of financial institutions and thus increases the vulnerability of the fund to more bank failures.

A more effective approach to raising deposit insurance premiums is to stiffen the back of regulators on issues of capital adequacy. The fund's liabilities decrease in direct ratio to the strengthened capital positions of the institutions it insures.

Simply put, the most prudential guarantee of a sound deposit insurance system is the maintenance of prudential capital ratios. Invested capital not only provides a cushion between an institution's balance sheet and the taxpayer, but also keeps lending and investment decisions grounded in disciplined market principles.

Accordingly, it has been disappointing in recent weeks to hear key Federal banking regulators continue to embrace a minimalist 3 percent leveraging ratio. It is not good enough for regulators to espouse the virtues of higher capital standards, then allow weakly capitalized institutions new and risky powers and asset growth.

Ironically, in American banking the bigger the institution, the weaker it is. The institutions with the weakest loan portfolios, highest overheads, and most vulnerable regional economies are the coastal money center banks.

Fortunately, as publicly traded institutions, these are the very banks with the most sophisticated capacity to raise capital. The lacking ingredient is will. In order to insulate shareholders to the maximum extent possible from the lending mistakes of management, money center banks prefer overleveraging to stock dilution, but for the sake of fairness—that is, not to saddle healthy smaller banks with higher premiums to insure against the losses of the larger international banks—and for the sake of banking soundness, it is clear

that more capital is preferable to the imposition of higher costs.

Raising money the old fashioned way—through equity markets—has the advantage of increasing individual bank stability and profitability. It also has the advantage of providing capital to still healthy institutions so that they can be better positioned to take over and manage, without excessive taxpayer risk, the unhealthy institutions and loan portfolios of the thrift industry.

Money center banks have taken impressive strides in the past 5 years to decrease their LDC debt liabilities. Nevertheless, in too many formidable instances, it is clear that as improved as major bank balance sheets are, more capital is needed.

If, on the other hand, regulators decide that higher premiums are needed, I would hope that consideration would be given to recognizing the unfair burdens that might be put on well capitalized banks. One possible approach would be to establish a category of banks—perhaps those with tangible capital in excess of 8 percent of assets—and allow such banks a discount in their premium obligations. Such an approach is the inverse of placing premiums on foreign deposits but would have an analogous effect.

Here it should be stressed that from a fairness perspective the case for placing premiums on foreign deposits is powerful. The problem is that if the premiums are more than the earnings spread, American banks could be placed at a competitive disadvantage and would almost certainly cede business opportunities to foreign competitors or develop legal loopholes using foreign subsidiaries to evade payment of American insurance fees.

My sense is its time in banking for regulators to get tough with the powerful few in order to be fair to the industry as a whole and compassionate to the individual taxpayer.

At the risk of simplicity, the insurance issue could most easily be resolved if the Chairmen of the Federal Reserve and the FDIC simply pen a modest number of "Dear John" letters—missives notifying undercapitalized institutions that if given amounts of capital aren't raised by a given date, the top three or four officers of non-complying institutions will be removed.

Such an approach might get the attention of the banks, decrease the need for higher premiums, and make it clear to the taxpayer that never again will the American public be on the line for a financial bail-out of the financial community.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5610, a bill amending the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. I want to congratulate Chairman GONZALEZ and ranking minority member, CHALMERS WYLIE, and their staffs for their diligent work in bringing this bill to the floor in such a timely manner. As we have recently become aware, this legislation is very much in need.

Mr. SPEAKER, last week, the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee received testimony from Chairman Greenspan of the Federal Reserve Board, as well as reports from the Congressional Budget Office and the General Accounting Office. All sources confirm that the bank insurance fund is in trouble. For example, the General Accounting Office

reports that as of the first of this year, the FDIC had 35 large financial institutions on its list of troubled banks that may fail this year or require financial assistance from the bank insurance fund. GAO also stated that if these banks failed over a short period of time, the bank insurance fund would probably become insolvent. Given the very important role the Bank Insurance Fund plays as the underpinning of confidence in our financial system, this is extremely troubling news.

Similarly, the Congressional Budget Office reports that 900 banks have failed over the last 5 years. This is twice as many failures as took place during the first 45 years since the deposit insurance fund was created. CBO also believes that as many as 600 banks could fail between the start of this year and the end of 1993. These additional failures could cost the Bank Insurance Fund approximately \$21 billion. In contrast, the insurance fund contains only about \$11 billion. Obviously, the fund is in great jeopardy.

Consequently, I strongly support the content of H.R. 5610. This critical legislation is arriving just in time. The bill will eliminate the 32.5 cents per every \$100 insured maximum premium allowed under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act passed by the Congress last year. It will also eliminate the 7.5-cent limit on annual increases allowed under current law. In addition, the bill will give authority to the FDIC to increase insurance premiums as it sees fit, so long as the banking industry is given a 60-day notice prior to the date the new rates take effect. In summary, this legislation takes the right action at the right time.

Mr. SPEAKER, I am hopeful that all of the questions regarding our banking system will be addressed in comprehensive legislation next year. There is clearly a need to reform the deposit insurance system, to answer the question of permissible banking powers, and to make adjustments within the FIRREA legislation to guard against further losses. However, until that time, the stability of the Nation's banking system requires that we pass this important legislation.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5610.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks and include therein extraneous material on H.R. 5610, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL POLICY ON PERMANENT PAPERS

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 226) to establish a National Policy on Permanent Papers, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. Res. 226

Whereas it is now widely recognized and scientifically demonstrated that the acidic papers commonly used in documents, books, and other publications for more than a century are self-destructing and will continue to self destruct;

Whereas Americans are facing the prospect of continuing to lose national historical, scientific and scholarly records, including government records, faster than salvage efforts can be mounted despite the dedicated efforts of many libraries, archives, and agencies, such as the Library of Congress and the National Archives and Records Administration;

Whereas the Congress has already appropriated \$50,000,000 to the National Archives and Records Administration, \$32,000,000 to the Library of Congress, and \$2,400,000 to the National Library of Medicine for deacidifying or micro-filming books too brittle for ordinary use, and \$25,000,000 to the National Endowment for the Humanities for grants to libraries and archives for such purposes;

Whereas nationwide many hundreds of millions of dollars will have to be spent by the Federal, State, and local governments and private institutions to salvage the most essential books and other materials in the libraries and archives of academic and private institutions;

Whereas there is an urgent need to prevent the continuance of the acid paper problem into the indefinite future;

Whereas acid free permanent papers with a life of several hundred years already are being produced at prices competitive with acid papers;

Whereas the American Library Association Council in a resolution dated January 13, 1988, has urged publishers to use acid free permanent papers in books and other publications of enduring use and value, and other professional organizations have expressed similar opinions;

Whereas some publishers such as the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the Library of Congress and many university presses are already publishing on acid free permanent papers, and the Office of Technology Assessment has estimated that only 15 to 25 percent of the books currently being published in the United States are printed on such paper;

Whereas even when books are printed on acid free permanent paper this fact is often not made known to libraries by notations in the book or by notations in standard bibliographic listings;

Whereas most Government agencies do not require the use of acid free permanent

papers for appropriate Federal records and publications, and associations representing commercial publishers and book printers have thus far not recommended the use of such papers;

Whereas paper manufacturers have stated that a sufficient supply of acid free permanent papers would be produced if publishers would specify the use of such papers; and

Whereas there is currently no statistical information from public or private sources regarding the present volume of production of acid free permanent papers and the volume of production required to meet an increased demand: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the resolution from the Senate (S.J. Res. 57) entitled "Joint Resolution to establish a national policy on permanent papers", do pass with the following

AMENDMENTS:

Strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert:

SECTION 1. It is the policy of the United States that Federal records, books, and publications of enduring value be produced on acid free permanent papers.

SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States urgently recommends that—

(1) Federal agencies require the use of acid free permanent papers for publications of enduring value produced by the Government Printing Office or produced by Federal grant or contract, using the specifications for such paper established by the Joint Committee on Printing;

(2) Federal agencies require the use of archival quality acid free papers for permanently valuable Federal records and confer with the National Archives and Records Administration on the requirements for paper quality;

(3) American publishers and State and local governments use acid free permanent papers for publications of enduring value, in voluntary compliance with the American National Standard;

(4) all publishers, private and governmental, prominently note the use of acid free permanent paper in books, advertisements, catalogs, and standard bibliographic listings; and

(5) the Secretary of State, Librarian of Congress, Archivist of the United States, and other Federal officials make known the national policy regarding acid free permanent papers to foreign governments and appropriate international agencies since the acid paper problem is worldwide and essential foreign materials being imported by our libraries are printed on acid papers.

SEC. 3. The Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, and the Public Printer shall jointly monitor the Federal Government's progress in implementing the national policy declared in section 1 regarding acid free permanent papers and shall report to the Congress regarding such progress on December 31, 1991, December 31, 1993, and December 31, 1995. In carrying out the monitoring and reporting functions under this section, the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, and the Public Printer may consult with the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Agricultural Library, National Library of Medicine, other Federal and State agencies, international organizations, private publishers, paper manufacturers, and other organizations with an interest in preservation of books and historical papers.

Amend the preamble so as to read:

Whereas it is now widely recognized and

scientifically demonstrated that the acidic papers commonly used for more than a century in documents, books, and other publications are self-destructing and will continue to self destruct;

Whereas Americans are facing the prospect of continuing to lose national, historical, scientific, and scholarly records, including government records, faster than salvage efforts can be mounted despite the dedicated efforts of many libraries, archives, and agencies, such as the Library of Congress and the National Archives and Records Administration;

Whereas nationwide hundreds of millions of dollars will have to be spent by the Federal, State, and local governments and private institutions to salvage the most essential books and other materials in the libraries and archives of government, academic, and private institutions;

Whereas paper manufacturers can produce a sufficient supply of acid free permanent papers with a life of several hundred years, at prices competitive with acid papers, if publishers would specify the use of such papers, and some publishers and many university presses are already publishing on acid free permanent papers;

Whereas most Government agencies do not require the use of acid free permanent papers for appropriate Federal records and publications;

Whereas librarians, publishers, and other professional groups have urged the use of acid free permanent papers;

Whereas even when books are printed on acid free permanent paper this fact is often not made known to libraries by notations in the book or by notations in standard bibliographic listings; and

Whereas there is an urgent need to prevent the continuance of the acid paper problem in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Attest:

Clerk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. McCANDLESS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 226 establishes a national policy on the use of acid free permanent paper for the publication of important books and records. The resolution is a response to the deterioration of books printed on paper with high acid content.

Books can have useful lives for hundreds of years. But books printed on acidic paper can become unusable in 50 to 100 years. The use of acidic paper became commonplace during the last century. Since most books have been printed on acidic paper, Federal, State, local and private libraries are spending millions of dollars to preserve them.

There is a simple and very cost effective way to prevent these problems in

the future. By printing books on acid free permanent paper, we can avoid the need for heroic and expensive measures to save documents.

That is the purpose of House Joint Resolution 226. The resolution establishes a formal policy that Federal records, books, and publications of enduring value be produced on acid free permanent papers. This is a no-cost solution because acid free paper is now widely available at the same price as acidic paper.

Let me offer an example of the consequences and expense of preserving materials printed on acidic paper. The Archivist of the United States has testified that Federal papers from the World War II period were printed on acidic paper. As the 50th anniversary of the war approaches, these papers are now becoming fragile and difficult to use. The cost of transferring the records to a more stable medium would exceed \$71 million.

We can avoid future expenditures for preservation if Federal agencies use acid free paper today. That is the policy behind House Joint Resolution 226.

The substitute adopted by the Committee on Government Operations without dissent is similar to the original resolution. The preamble has been reworded and the reporting requirement has been revised so that reports will be filed every other year until 1995. I believe that all of the changes will be acceptable to the principal sponsor of a similar resolution in the other body.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 226 as amended. I would like to commend Chairman WISE and the resolution's sponsor, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], for their work in crafting this legislation.

House Joint Resolution 226 is a joint resolution which declares it the policy of the United States that all Federal records, books and publications of enduring value should be printed on acid-free permanent papers. As amended, the measure also recommends that American publishers as well as State and local governments voluntarily use acid-free papers for significant publications. It recommends that the Secretary of State make foreign governments aware of the U.S. preference for acid-free papers on documents of lasting significance. And finally, it asks the Librarian of Congress to report to the Congress on the act's progress in the years 1991, 1993 and 1995.

House Joint Resolution 226 is purely a policy statement, and contains no enforcement provisions. It is a companion bill to Senate Joint Resolution

57, which passed the Senate by voice vote in July of last year.

The need for this legislation is simple. Most of the paper we use today has been processed from wood pulp and contains a highly acidic residue. This acid causes a rapid breakdown of the paper's structure and can limit document life to 50 to 75 years. Documents printed on non-acidic papers can easily last three to five times longer.

Because recent changes in U.S. environmental laws have encouraged industry to explore new paper processing techniques, in many cases it is now more cost effective for paper processors to produce non-acidic papers than it is for them to remove acid residues from waste water. Hence, non-acidic paper production is up, and the United States is now producing more than enough alkaline paper to meet the goals established in House Joint Resolution 226.

Clearly, both the need for House Joint Resolution 226 and the means for fulfilling it exist. Today's resolution simply states our belief that given the ability, we as a Nation should seek to preserve our country's literary treasures. It is a worthy goal, and I urge the measure's passage.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the House today is acting to approve House Joint Resolution 226, "Establishing a National Policy on Permanent Papers," which I had the honor to introduce on March 23, 1989. I want to thank my numerous cosponsors, the Committee on Government Operations which reported the measure favorably, the Committee on House Administration for waiving joint jurisdiction, and the numerous individuals and organizations from the library, archival, and publishing worlds that gave their support to this historic measure.

I am confident that the Senate, which has passed a similar measure (S.J. Res. 57), will accept the House language and thus avoid the need for a conference this late in the session.

This measure marks a turning point in preserving important printed work of our Nation. Section 1 states:

It is the policy of the United States that Federal records, books, and publications of enduring value be produced on acid free permanent papers." It also in Section 2 urgently recommends that: "American publishers and State and local governments use acid free permanent papers for publications of enduring value. . . ."

The United States, as well as other countries, has been losing many of our basic historic, scientific, cultural and governmental records because the paper on which they were printed has deteriorated—or we have spent vast sums to preserve them by deacidification or microfilming. The root cause of the problem is the acidic process of producing printing and writing papers adopted in the mid-19th century which resulted in papers that self-destruct in a very few decades. The solu-

tion to the problem urged in the joint resolution is the substitution of alkaline papers which will last for several centuries and cost no more to produce.

The mere introduction of the joint resolutions in the House and Senate early last year attracted attention and sparked remedial action in this country and abroad among State, local, and foreign governments, and among paper producers and publishers of books and journals. The movement toward alkaline papers had already started in a small way when these resolutions were introduced little more than a year and a half ago, but there can be no doubt that they have greatly speeded up the process.

It can be fairly said that this measure will result in the preservation of priceless historic records which might otherwise be lost, and in the savings of many millions of dollars which otherwise would be spent in salvaging documents or papers or microfilming their contents.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 226, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1300

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations and the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 57) establishing a national policy on permanent papers, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] to explain his request.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose is simply to substitute the text and the preamble of the House joint resolution for the text and preamble of the Senate

joint resolution passed earlier by the Senate.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 57

Whereas it is now widely recognized and scientifically demonstrated that the acidic papers commonly used in documents, books, and other publications for more than a century are self-destructing and will continue to self destruct;

Whereas Americans are facing the prospect of continuing to lose national historical, scientific and scholarly records, including government records, faster than salvage efforts can be mounted despite the dedicated efforts of many libraries, archives, and agencies, such as the Library of Congress and the National Archives and Records Administration;

Whereas the Congress has already appropriated \$50,000,000 to the National Archives and Records Administration, \$32,000,000 to the Library of Congress, and \$2,400,000 to the National Library of Medicine for deacidifying or microfilming books too brittle for ordinary use, and \$25,000,000 to the National Endowment for the Humanities for grants to libraries and archives for such purposes;

Whereas nationwide many hundreds of millions of dollars will have to be spent by the Federal, State, and local government and private institutions to salvage the most essential books and other materials in the libraries and archives of academic and private institutions;

Whereas there is an urgent need to prevent the continuance of the acid paper problem into the indefinite future;

Whereas acid free permanent papers with a life of several hundred years already are being produced at prices competitive with acid papers;

Whereas the American Library Association Council in a resolution dated January 13, 1988, has urged publishers to use acid free permanent papers in books and other publications of enduring use and value, and other professional organizations have expressed similar opinions;

Whereas some publishers such as the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the Library of Congress and many university presses are already publishing on acid free permanent papers, and the Office of Technology Assessment has estimated that only 15 to 25 percent of the books currently being published in the United States are printed on such paper;

Whereas even when books are printed on acid free permanent paper this fact is often not made known to libraries by notations in the book or by notations in standard bibliographic listings;

Whereas most Government agencies do not require the use of acid free permanent papers for appropriate Federal records and publications, and associations representing commercial publishers and book printers have thus far not recommended the use of such papers;

Whereas paper manufacturers have stated that a sufficient supply of acid free permanent papers would be produced if publishers would specify the use of such papers; and

Whereas there is currently no statistical information from public or private sources regarding the present volume of production of acid free permanent papers and the volume of production required to meet an increased demand: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. It is the policy of the United States that Federal records, books, and publications of enduring value be produced on acid free permanent papers.

SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States urgently recommends the following:

(1) Federal agencies require the use of acid free permanent papers for publications of enduring value produced by the Government Printing Office or produced by Federal grant or contract, using the specifications for such paper established by the Joint Committee on Printing.

(2) Federal agencies require the use of archival quality acid free papers for permanently valuable Federal records and confer with the National Archives and Records Administration on the requirements for paper quality.

(3) American publishers use acid free permanent papers for publications of enduring value, in voluntary compliance with the American National Standard, and note the use of such paper on books, in advertisements, in catalogs, and in standard bibliographic listings.

(4) Reliable statistics be produced by public or private institutions on the present production of acid free permanent papers and the volume of production required to meet the national policy declared in section 1.

(5) The Secretary of State make known the national policy regarding acid free permanent papers to foreign governments and appropriate international agencies since the acid paper problem is worldwide and essential foreign materials being imported by our libraries are printed on acid papers.

SEC. 3. The Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, the Director of the National Library of Medicine, and the Administrator of the National Library of Agriculture shall jointly monitor the Nation's progress in implementing the national policy declared in section 1 regarding acid free permanent papers and report annually to the Congress regarding such progress by January 1, 1991, and each succeeding year thereafter.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WISE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Wise moves to strike all after the resolving clause of Senate Joint Resolution 57 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of House Joint Resolution 226, as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WISE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Wise moves to strike the preamble of Senate Joint Resolution 57 and to insert in lieu thereof the preamble of House Joint Resolution 226, as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a

motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 226) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 226 and Senate Joint Resolution 57, the joint resolutions just passed, and to include extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

CHATTAHOOCHEE NATIONAL FOREST FACILITIES

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2419) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain property in the Chattahoochee National Forest for the construction of facilities in the national forest, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2419

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO EXCHANGE FOREST SERVICE PROPERTY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FOREST SERVICE FACILITIES.

Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture (in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") may convey any of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any of the property described in section 3(1) in exchange for the construction of the facilities described in section 3(2) or the conveyance to the Secretary of real property and construction of such facilities, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON EXCHANGE.

(a) EXCHANGE AGREEMENT.—In conducting any exchange under section 1, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with a non-Federal party sufficient, in the determination of the Secretary, to assure that the non-Federal party will cause to be constructed for the Federal Service the facilities described in section 3(2).

(b) EXCHANGE FOR EQUAL VALUE.—In conducting any exchange under section 1, the Secretary shall assure that the value of the property received by the Secretary is equal to the value of the property conveyed by the Secretary, as determined by the Secretary, or if they are not equal, that values are equalized by the payment of money to the non-Federal party or to the Secretary, as follows:

(1) LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount of the payment may not exceed 25 percent of the total value of any property conveyed by the Secretary in the exchange. The Secretary shall, to the extent possible, minimize the amount of the payment of money involved in the exchange.

(2) DETERMINATION OF VALUE OF FACILITIES CONSTRUCTED.—The value of the facilities

constructed for the Forest Service under the exchange shall be equal to the actual costs of construction of such facilities, as determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, in accordance with the specifications contained in the document referred to in section 3(2).

SEC. 3. DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTIES.

The properties referred to in this Act shall consist of the following:

(1) **PROPERTY CONVEYED BY SECRETARY.**—The properties conveyed by the Secretary may consist of any lands of the Forest Service within the State of Georgia that were acquired solely for administrative purposes, together with any improvements located on the lands, described in the document entitled "Chattahoochee National Forest Land Exchange—Description of Properties Conveyed", which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the United States Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, Washington, District of Columbia.

(2) **FACILITIES CONSTRUCTED FOR FOREST SERVICE.**—The facilities constructed for the National Forest Service shall consist of the facilities the location and specifications of which are described in the document entitled "Prospectus, Blairsville Ranger District Office and Facilities, Brasstown Ranger District, Chattahoochee National Forest", which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the United States Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, Washington, District of Columbia.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2419, as amended, and move its consideration by the House.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2419, as amended, would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey any of the right, title, and interest of the United States in certain administrative sites in the State of Georgia in exchange for the construction of a Forest Service ranger district office and visitor information center.

This bill would provide for the construction of a badly needed ranger station for the Brasstown Ranger District of the Chattahoochee National Forest, in lieu of the rental properties the Forest Service now occupies. In exchange for this facility, the Forest Service would be able to dispose of a number of administrative sites that are no longer of use and value to the government.

The Secretary, in consummating this exchange, is required to assure that the value of the property received by the Secretary is equal to the value of the property conveyed, with provision for cash equalization payments if necessary. This provision is consistent with current policy regarding Forest Service exchange authorities.

Mr. Speaker, while the committee has expressed concern in the past over certain Forest Service proposals to exchange lands for facilities, I would note that since this exchange effects administrative sites rather than forested lands, we have no objection. However, the committee intends to continue to monitor such exchanges to ensure that National Forest System lands are not used as exchange material to supplement the agency's construction and land acquisition budget.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our colleague, Mr. JENKINS, for introducing H.R. 2419 and move its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JENKINS], who is the author of the legislation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. DE LA GARZA and the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, for their outstanding work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this measure will provide a much-needed permanent district office in the Brasstown Ranger District, which I represent. Since the early 1950's, the ranger office has been located in various rental properties in the town of Blairsville. The Forest Service needs a visible and accessible permanent ranger office to serve as an Information Station and Visitor Center for the three hundred thousand annual visitors seeking recreational opportunities in this section of the Chattahoochee National Forest. Additionally, a permanent ranger office would be designed to meet the additional space requirements of the district range staff, who are responsible for managing and protecting the more than 108,000 acres.

The Forest Service already owns a tract of land which is ideal for this new ranger office. The tract is located near Blairsville on the recently completed Appalachian Highway, Georgia 5, which is the major access route from the population center of metropolitan Atlanta into this portion of the Chattahoochee National Forest. The location of a new office adjacent to this major highway would make the Forest Service more visible and accessible to the public and meet the need for additional space.

Six improved lots and two vacant lots will be traded for the construction

of the new ranger office. These tracts were acquired in the 1950's and 1960's to serve as rental accommodations for Forest Service personnel who were frequently transferred. Today, these employees generally buy their own homes, and these rental properties are no longer needed.

These properties will be exchanged on a value-for-value basis for a new district ranger office. In essence, this measure would make it possible to develop a much needed new ranger office facility while disposing of federally owned residential property, incurring no cost to the Federal Government. A prospectus prepared for the United States Forest Service shows the exchange to be economically feasible.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is supported by the local Forest Service, who asked me to introduce the measure, by the chairman of the Union County Commission where the new ranger office will be located, and by the Office of Management and Budget which has responsibility for the disposition of surplus property.

I again wish to express my thanks to chairman DE LA GARZA and chairman VOLKMER for their support and urge members to support it.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will use only a few seconds just to say that this measure has been worked out locally, and I commend the gentleman who has just spoken to us because of his leadership in this area.

The measure was heard by our subcommittee for passage. It is appropriate that this measure be brought to the floor and passed.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2419, as amended.

The question was taken and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CRANBERRY WILDERNESS BOUNDARY

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1576) to modify the boundary of the Cranberry Wilderness, located in

the Monogahela National Forest, WV, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1576

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

The boundary of the Cranberry Wilderness located within the Monogahela National Forest, West Virginia, is modified as depicted on a map entitled "Cranberry Wilderness Area Revised" dated October 1987, on file in the Office of the Chief, Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes of the time on behalf of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1576, sponsored by my colleague from West Virginia, Mr. STAGGERS, would modify the boundary of the Cranberry Wilderness in West Virginia to allow the construction of an acid neutralization station on the north fork of the Cranberry River. Approximately 5 acres would be taken out of the wilderness for the station. The station would facilitate the restoration of a trout fishery in the Cranberry River.

The bill would add 5 acres of land to the Cranberry Wilderness to replace the acreage taken out. It also would require that the acid neutralization station be constructed in such a way as to minimize its impact on the wilderness and to conform to the landscape.

Furthermore, the bill would give study river protections to those portions of the north fork of the Cherry River, the Gauley River and the Cranberry River that flow within the Monogahela National Forest. This corrects an oversight in the West Virginia River Act of 1988. One hundred miles of river would receive interim protection.

These provisions were added by an amendment of Congressman RAHALL during Interior Committee action.

The bill has bipartisan support and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON], on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1576 introduced by Mr. STAGGERS of West Virginia and ably shepherded through the Interior Committee by Mr. RAHALL.

This legislation proposes a minor boundary adjustment to West Virginia's Cranberry Wilderness on the Monogahela National Forest to allow construction of a fish enhancement project on a site currently within the existing wilderness boundary.

In exchange for the 5 acres taken out of the wilderness boundary for the fish enhancement project, an equal acreage of national forest acreage outside the current wilderness boundary will be added to the Cranberry Wilderness. This will result in a no net loss of wilderness.

H.R. 1576 also corrects an oversight in the West Virginia wild rivers bill from the last Congress by giving river study protection to segments of the Cranberry, Gauley and north Cherry Rivers within the Monogahela National Forest. This provision essentially prevents development of these rivers for 3 years when the Forest Service will have completed its study of these river segments for their suitability as potential additions to the wild and scenic rivers system.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1576.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1576, as amended, and urge its adoption by the House.

H.R. 1576, introduced by our colleague Mr. STAGGERS, would modify the boundary of the Cranberry Wilderness located in the Monogahela National Forest in West Virginia. The bill was introduced on March 22, 1989, and jointly referred to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1576 was amended by the Committee on Agriculture to permit the deletion of a tract of 5 acres from the existing wilderness area and to offset this by the addition of another 5-acre tract elsewhere in the wilderness. This adjustment will allow the State of West Virginia to construct a facility to treat the Cranberry River to reduce its acidity and thus promote a year-round trout population in the river.

The bill also provides interim wild and scenic river protection for parts of the Cranberry, Gauley, and North Fork of the Cherry River, through their designation for study in accordance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our House colleagues to support H.R. 1576, as amended.

□ 1310

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, anytime we discuss the subject of removing land from a wilderness area, we immediately attract a lot of attention. In this particular case, though, as the Members will notice, with the two committees working together to see that this is accomplished, the rough edges have been taken off. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] has done an excellent job. This is appropriate for the sake of preserving this particular area.

So we do send this to the full House with the recommendation that Members support the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] in this effort to modify the boundaries of the Cranberry Wilderness Area.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 1576 is to modify the boundary of the Cranberry Wilderness Area in order to accommodate the West Virginia Division of Natural Resources' proposed acid neutralization treatment station on the north fork of the Cranberry River.

ry River in an effort to restore the river's fishery.

When Congress passed legislation to designate the Cranberry Wilderness Area in 1982, it appears we unintentionally precluded the construction of this project. In fact, the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources began drawing up plans for the facility during the late 1970's because, as it noted back then, the Cranberry, one of the finest trout fishing streams in the State, was becoming so acidic that trout could only survive for a few months each year.

This pending legislation, introduced by my colleague from West Virginia, HARLEY STAGGERS, was reported by the Interior Committee with an amendment in the nature of a substitute that I offered during consideration of the bill by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. It is my understanding that the Agriculture Committee subsequently reported identical bill language.

The bill before us today incorporates the agreement that has been reached between the West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, interested parties from the environmental community, Representative STAGGERS and myself on the scope of the Cranberry Wilderness boundary modification and the type of project that may be built. Under the pending legislation, 4.85 acres of land in the vicinity of the confluence of the north fork and the main stem of the Cranberry River would be withdrawn from wilderness in order to support the construction of the acid neutralization project. However, this same amount of acreage would be added to the wilderness area's southern boundary. As such, there will be no net loss of designated wilderness area.

It should be noted that the bill would also impose a number of protective stipulations on the project so as to ensure that it is compatible with the surrounding environment. For example, we are envisioning a project that would be built primarily of wood so that it will blend into the immediate surroundings. Further, this legislation was considered with our understanding that the environmental assessment and decision notice will be modified to provide measures for the mitigation of noise, vehicle traffic, and visual impacts of the project. Finally, it is also our understanding that a permit for this project would have to be issued by the State Water Resources Division as the Cranberry and its headwaters are protected under the West Virginia Natural Streams Preservation System.

One aspect of the pending legislation initiated by this gentleman from West Virginia is its provision to extend the protections afforded to study rivers under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to the following river segments located within the exterior boundaries of the Monongahela National Forest. The 33-mile segment of the Cranberry River from its headwaters to its confluence with the Gauley; the 52-mile segment of the Gauley River from its headwater to its confluence with the Cherry; and, the entire 15.6 miles of the north fork of the Cherry River. These protections would be in place until December 31, 1993. However, it must be stressed that the legislation clearly states that the protections afforded to study rivers shall not prohibit the construction, maintenance and use of the proposed acid neutral-

ization treatment station on the north fork of the Cranberry River.

The 33-mile segment of the Cranberry River from its source on the south fork downstream to its confluence with the Gauley River has already been determined to be eligible under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System under a study conducted pursuant to section 5(a)(74) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. The segment of the Gauley River that lies within the exterior boundaries of the Monongahela National Forest was also part of this study and a portion of the segment was found to be eligible as well. In part, the legislation simply serves to reapply the 3-year study river protections—which expired in 1988—afforded under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to these segments.

It should be noted that a coalition of organizations—including Trout Unlimited, the Sierra Club, and American Rivers—has recommended that the Forest Service conduct suitability studies on 12 segments involving about 260 miles of river within the Monongahela National Forest. I not only endorse this proposal but it is my intention, at the appropriate time, to pursue wild and scenic river designations within the forest. The study river protections provided by H.R. 1576 for the Cranberry, north fork of the Cherry and the Gauley should serve as a clear signal of this intention.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1576, to modify the boundary of the Cranberry Wilderness, allowing for the construction of an acid neutralization station on the north fork of the Cranberry River.

We treasure our natural resources in West Virginia, and the Cranberry Wilderness area is one of our proudest. The legislation that I offer for your consideration today is intended to make sure that it stays that way.

The Cranberry River used to be one of the finest trout streams in West Virginia. However, the river has become more and more acidic in recent years, to the point where trout can live only a few months of the year. Because the segment of the river where the acid neutralization station needs to be built falls within the Cranberry Wilderness Area, it is necessary to modify the boundary to prevent violation of the Wilderness Act.

While a wilderness area boundary modification is not something that we should ever take lightly, the cause at hand and the means of restoring the life of the river weigh heavily in favor of doing so. The use of crushed limestone as an acid neutralization process has proved very effective in other areas, and the stations are constructed so that they blend with the natural surroundings. And I believe the value of restoring the Cranberry River to its former status as one of our best trout streams is understood by everyone.

The bill removes 5 acres of land from the Cranberry Wilderness where the station needs to be built, and it adds 5 acres of national forest land to the Cranberry Wilderness, so there is no net loss to the wilderness area. And while I want to reiterate that the necessity of this boundary modification has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of every one involved, I want to state in the strongest possible terms that this is not intended to serve as a precedent for any future boundary modifica-

tion. Our action today stands on its own merits.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Interior and Agriculture Committee for their help and cooperation in crafting this legislation, and I want to thank the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources and the West Virginia Sierra Club for their work in making this legislation a reality.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1576, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAINE WILDERNESS ACT OF 1990

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2205) to designate certain lands in the State of Maine as wilderness.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2205

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Maine Wilderness Act of 1990".

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS.

In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131-1136), certain land in the White Mountain National Forest, in the State of Maine—

(1) which comprise approximately twelve thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Caribou-Speckled Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987; and

(2) which shall be known as the Caribou-Speckled Mountain Wilderness,

are hereby designated wilderness, and, therefore, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

SEC. 3. MAPS AND DESCRIPTIONS.

As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the wilderness area designated by this Act with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives and with the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the United States Senate. The map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that correction of clerical and typographical errors in such map and description may be made by the Secretary. The map and description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the

Office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION OF WILDERNESS.

Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness area designated by this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. WILDERNESS REVIEW CONCERNS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Department of Agriculture has completed the second roadless area review and evaluation program (RARE II); and

(2) the Congress has made its own review and examination of National Forest System roadless areas in the Maine section of the White Mountain National Forest and of the environmental impacts associated with alternative allocations of such areas.

(b) DETERMINATION.—On the basis of such review, the Congress hereby determines and directs that—

(1) without passing on the question of the legal and factual sufficiency of the RARE II final environmental statement (dated January 1979) with respect to National Forest System lands in the State of Maine; such statement shall not be subject to judicial review with respect to National Forest System lands in the State of Maine;

(2) with respect to the National Forest System lands in the State of Maine which were reviewed by the Department of Agriculture in the second roadless area review and evaluation (RARE II) and those lands referred to in subsection (d), that review and evaluation or reference shall be deemed for the purposes of the initial land management plans required for such lands by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, to be an adequate consideration of the suitability of such lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and the Department of Agriculture shall not be required to review the wilderness option prior to the revisions of the plans, but shall review the wilderness option when the plans are revised, which revisions will ordinarily occur on a ten-year cycle, or at least every fifteen years, unless, prior to such time, the Secretary of Agriculture finds that conditions in a unit have significantly changed;

(3) areas in the State of Maine reviewed in such final environmental statement or referenced in subsection (d) and not designated wilderness upon enactment of this Act shall be managed for multiple use in accordance with land management plans pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976: *Provided*, That such areas need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation prior to or during revision of the initial land management plans;

(4) in the event that revised land management plans in the State of Maine are implemented pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, and other applicable law, areas not recommended for wilderness designation need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation prior to or during revision of such plans, and

areas recommended for wilderness designation shall be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation as may be required by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, and other applicable law; and

(5) unless expressly authorized by Congress, the Department of Agriculture shall not conduct any further statewide roadless area review and evaluation of National Forest System lands in the State of Maine for the purpose of determining their suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(c) REVISION.—As used in this section, and as provided in section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, the term "revisions" shall not include an "amendment" to a plan.

(d) APPLICATION OF SECTION.—The provisions of this section shall also apply to National Forest System roadless lands in the State of Maine which are less than 5,000 acres in size.

SEC. 6. PROHIBITION ON BUFFER ZONES.

Congress does not intend that the designation of a wilderness area in the State of Maine lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around the wilderness area. The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from within the wilderness area shall not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the wilderness area.

SEC. 7. CONTROL OF FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.

As provided in section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act, such measures may be taken within wilderness areas designated by this Act as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects and diseases, subject to applicable laws and such additional reasonable conditions as the Secretary deems desirable.

SEC. 8. STATE FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY.

As provided in section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State of Maine with respect to wildlife and fish in the National forests in Maine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to yield 10 minutes of my time to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la GARZA], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the

Senate bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2205, the Maine Wilderness Act, would designate 12,000 acres of the White Mountain National Forest as the Caribou Speckled Mountain Wilderness. Currently, the State of Maine has only one designated wilderness area, the 7,000-acre Moosehorn Wilderness in the Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge. The Caribou Speckled Mountain Wilderness would include Rocky Peaks with panoramic views of surrounding valleys, waterfalls, and many species of wildlife, including ruffed grouse, snowshoe hare, white-tailed deer, black bear, and moose. Brook trout are found in the lower reaches of many streams. This is a bipartisan bill, supported by all Members of Maine's congressional delegation and the administration.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to yield 10 minutes of my time to be controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON] on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will designate 12,000 acres of forest in the White Mountain National Forest as the National Wilderness Preservation System. The proposed wilderness area will include Caribou and Speckled Mountains.

In response to concerns from forest product users and environmentalists, the Forest Service, the Maine delegation, and an ad hoc committee developed H.R. 4145 as a compromise proposal. Selective timber harvesting would be permitted in the remaining 4,000 acres of the White Mountain National Forest where such harvesting is currently prohibited.

The ad hoc committee members consisted of representatives of the wood products industry, environmental groups, multiple use proponents, and State and local officials.

The entire Maine congressional delegation supports this legislation and a companion bill, S. 2205, which was introduced by Senator MITCHELL and cosponsored by Senator COHEN.

This bill stands as a tribute of leadership to the gentlewoman OLYMPIA SNOWE from Maine.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2205, the Maine Wilderness Act of 1990, and urge its adoption by the House.

S. 2205, which was introduced by the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, Mr. MITCHELL, would designate approximately 12,000 acres of land in the White Mountain National Forest in the State of Maine for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System. The area, which is to be designated as the Caribou-Speckled Mountain Wilderness, is consistent with the recommendations of the U.S. Forest Service and the administration, which supports this bill.

The lands to be included in this wilderness area are diverse and unique both in their topographical and biological features. In addition, the area offers outstanding opportunities for solitude and wild recreational experiences. As such, this area is appropriate for wilderness, which will assure its protection for the benefit of future generations.

I should also note, Mr. Speaker, that S. 2205 includes the standard sufficiency and release language that has been associated with wilderness bills since 1984. This language will provide for the release and subsequent multiple use management of lands that are currently roadless and were subject to study for possible wilderness designation as a part of the Forest Service's land management planning efforts. Approximately 4,000 acres, not designated as wilderness by this bill, are affected.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues in the Senate, Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. COHEN, for their leadership in developing this legislation. They, along with their House colleagues, Ms. SNOWE and Mr. BRENNAN, have worked together to fashion a compromise that will benefit the residents of Maine and others who visit the White Mountain National Forest for many years to come.

I want also to commend the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Forests, Family Farms, and Energy, Mr. VOLKMER, and the chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. VENTO, for moving this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to support S. 2205.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Committee is pleased to join in the processing of this particular measure. We pay

particular credit to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], who introduced the House version, but as indicated by other speakers, it is supported by the entire Maine delegation.

We add this 12,000 acres to the State of Maine in wilderness designation. They currently have a 7,000-acre wilderness designation, so this is a significant expansion for them. This meets all the criteria that both committees have established for this sort of designation.

So, Mr. Speaker, we congratulate the folks in the State of Maine, and I am pleased to support this measure adding this acreage to the wilderness area of the State of Maine.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would echo the sentiments of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON] in paying tribute to this work of the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] for crafting this compromise and bringing it before us here today. Unfortunately, she has been delayed on her return from Maine, but I know she would join us in requesting unanimous support for this measure in the House.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the entire Maine delegation, led by the majority leader of the Senate and by the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BRENNAN] on the House side, supported this effort, and we appreciate their good work in bringing this measure before us.

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my full support for S. 2205, the Maine Wilderness Act of 1990, a bill which will protect forever 12,000 acres of pristine Maine forestland.

I would like to thank Chairman VENTO for his help and support, as well as all the members of the Interior and Agriculture Committees for their efforts in bringing this bill to the floor.

The Maine Wilderness Act is the product of years of deliberation and study.

It is the final result of an ongoing process that began in 1983, when I was Governor of Maine.

I am proud to be here today, and to join with my colleague Congresswoman SNOWE in urging you to support S. 2205.

Caribou-Speckled Mountain is part of the White Mountain National Forest, and is one of the last potential wilderness areas in the State of Maine.

The U.S. Forest Service recommended wilderness designation for the area in 1985.

The Maine congressional delegation then created an ad hoc committee, representing all concerned parties, including the forest products industry, environmental groups, and State and local government, to develop a consensus use plan for the region.

The ad hoc committee recommended a wilderness designation, and a public hearing on the committee's decision was held in Bethel, ME, in 1988.

This legislation demonstrates Maine's commitment to protecting its valued timber resources.

While the bill sets aside 12,000 acres for wilderness, to be untouched by the hand of man, 4,000 adjoining acres will be released for mixed uses, including some logging.

This compromise, fully supported by both industry and environmental advocates, as well as all four Members of the Maine congressional delegation, promises both environmental protection, and continuing access to public timber.

Caribou-Speckled Mountain is one of the most scenic areas in the State of Maine—a State justifiably famous for its natural beauty, and scenic landscapes.

The Maine Wilderness Act will keep this pristine area untouched, so that future generations may truly appreciate the gift that is Maine's natural heritage.

I ask your support for this carefully drafted, conservation-minded bill.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to rise today in support of S. 2205, the Maine Wilderness Act of 1990. This legislation will designate 12,000 acres of pristine forest in the White Mountain National Forest as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

The proposed wilderness area will include Caribou and Speckled Mountains and is one of the most scenic and breathtaking locations in the State of Maine. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of final passage of S. 2205.

First, I would like to thank Subcommittee Chairman VENTO and ranking minority member MARLENEE as well as Committee Chairman UDALL and ranking minority member YOUNG. I also owe my appreciation to Subcommittee Chairman VOLKMER and ranking minority member MORRISON as well as Chairman DE LA GARZA and ranking minority member MADIGAN of the Agriculture Committee. Their leadership, and the assistance of the committee members and the committee staffs, was truly gratifying.

This legislation has the backing of the entire Maine delegation. We did not arrive at this introduction lightly. Several years of thorough review and study by the people of Maine, as well as the U.S. Forest Service, preceded this legislation.

Currently, there are no federally designated national forest wilderness areas in Maine—notwithstanding the fact that over 90 percent of the State is forested. Only Baxter State Park and the Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge have preserved large tracts of land in a natural state. Forty-five thousand acres of the White Mountain National Forest are located in Maine and the 16,000 acres in the Caribou-Speckled Mountain area represent the only Federal land currently eligible for wilderness designation.

Possible creation of a Caribou-Speckled Mountain wilderness area first surfaced in Congress back in 1983. At that time, portions of the White Mountain National Forest in Maine were included in a bill to create wilderness areas in the New Hampshire portion of

the forest. However, no hearings had been conducted on the Maine lands proposal.

Since there had been no opportunity to evaluate the impact of the proposal on our State, I asked that the Maine lands be removed from the New Hampshire bill so that an evaluation by the people most affected could proceed.

From that point, the Maine congressional delegation began a comprehensive review of the land, the needs and interests of Maine people, and the options that might exist. We asked the Forest Service to study the Caribou-Speckled area and provide a list of management options.

After a study, the Forest Service recommended that 12,000 of the 16,000 acre Caribou-Speckled Mountain area be designated as wilderness. The remaining 4,000 acres would be available for timber harvesting.

This Forest Service decision was based upon extensive review of the area's recreational and commercial values. Of particular note in the study was the increased demand for wilderness-related recreational experiences on public land. The Caribou-Speckled Mountain area is particularly popular with hikers and campers who visit the White Mountain National Forest in Maine. It represents one of the last, large undeveloped tracts in that area of Maine.

According to the Forest Service study, approximately 4,000 acres of the area is suitable for commercial timber harvesting. Most of the significant timber harvest areas will be released under H.R. 4145. The Forest Service concluded that "eliminating timber harvesting from the 12,000 acre area would have no discernible effect on local wood-using industries."

As part of our efforts to include the widest possible range of viewpoints, the congressional delegation appointed an ad hoc committee to study the Forest Service proposal. This committee was composed of representatives from environmental and conservation groups, landowners, lumber mill owners, and State and local officials.

On December 20, 1984, in its final of four meetings, the ad hoc committee endorsed, by a 9-to-2 vote, a compromise proposal that would designate 12,000 acres as permanent wilderness. Selective timber harvesting would be permitted in the remaining 4,000 acres of the White Mountain National Forest where such harvesting is currently prohibited.

On November 14, 1987, the Maine delegation held an open hearing in Bethel, ME, on the 12,000 acre wilderness proposal. During this hearing, concerned citizens were able to express their views and have their questions answered regarding the wilderness proposal. Every effort has been made to address the concerns raised during, and subsequent to, the hearing. This wilderness legislation represents an optimal compromise of these interested parties.

It is important to stress the fact that the Forest Service has held 16,000 acres of the White Mountain National Forest under a de facto wilderness status. There have been no timber sales in this area in over 20 years and the majority of the Caribou-Speckled Mountain area has not been cut in over 50 years. Enactment of S. 2205 would actually release

4,000 acres of timber for harvesting that is currently prohibited under existing management procedures.

In S. 2205 we have attempted, and I believe succeeded in, accommodating local concerns. In fact, the Maine delegation has made every effort to balance the needs of the wood product industry and multiple use proponents with the environmental concerns that some land be protected for future enjoyment.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of Maine's reputation as a leader in protecting its precious environment. The Maine Wilderness Act of 1990 reiterates our commitment to preserve portions of this environment for the enjoyment of future generations. I ask my colleagues to support the Maine Wilderness Act.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2205.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDING BOUNDARIES OF SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4811) to expand the boundaries of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4811

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXPANSION OF SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) EXPANSION.—Section 201(a) of the act entitled "An Act to amend the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Act of 1972; to provide for the establishment of the San Antonio National Historical Park; and other purposes" (16 U.S.C. 410ee(a)) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: "The park shall also consist of the lands and interests therein within the area bounded by the line depicted as 'Proposed Boundary Extension' on the maps entitled 'San Antonio Missions National Historical Park', numbered 472-80,075, 472-80,076, 472-80,077, 472-80,078, 472-80,079, 472-80,080, and 472-80,081 and dated June 7, 1990, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the same manner as is such drawing."

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES.—Section 201(f)(2) of such act is amended by striking "not more than \$500,000," and inserting "not more than \$15,000,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the measure presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in 2 years we will celebrate the 500th anniversary of Columbus' landing in the new world. Part of that celebration is the increased recognition of our Hispanic Heritage. Part of that heritage is found in the San Antonio Missions, four missions once on the Texas frontier and now located in the center of San Antonio.

H.R. 4811, introduced by our colleague ALBERT BUSTAMANTE, expands the boundaries of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park. This park preserves and interprets those four missions. H.R. 4811 also makes various adjustments in the boundary so that a visitor center can be constructed in time for the quincentennial in 1992. This legislation comes after a decade of the park's existence, and will provide greater protection for the park's resources.

The committee adopted an amendment that changes the dates of the map references and changes to authorization for the development ceiling to "not to exceed \$15,000,000." The development ceiling is based on the park's development program and construction of a visitor center in time for the quincentennial.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse H.R. 4811 and urge its passage.

□ 1320

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of this legislation to expand San Antonio Missions National Historical Park. This measure is based on a boundary study recently completed by the National Park Service and is supported by the administration.

The bill would add lands which include resources integral to the purposes for which the area was established. For example, the bill would include the San Juan Labores fields which were recently discovered during

archeological investigations. Also to be added are lands which would facilitate management of the area by consolidating park boundaries. These types of boundary changes can be clearly justified.

At the same time, the bill provides for the National Park Service to acquire every single linear foot of known irrigation ditches which are associated with these missions and the ruins of a ranch 25 miles from the park which is already protected in State ownership. Acquisitions such as these are questionable. Overall, the bill provides for a 300-percent increase in the amount of park land owned in fee simple by the Federal Government. Additionally, the bill provides a 30-fold increase in the park development ceiling.

This bill reflects a fundamental change in the management of this area from one where the Federal Government manages the area in partnership with other levels of government, to one in which the Federal Government assumes the lead in both management and fiscal obligations. The wisdom of this course of action in a time of shrinking Federal dollars is questionable.

Due to the important resource values of certain lands to be acquired I will support this bill and encourage my colleagues to join me.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and co-sponsor of this legislation who represents part of the area in which this historical park is located.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] for yielding to me at this point.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I just wanted to mention that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee mentioned that we will celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month between now, mid-September, and mid-October. What we are doing here is part of the heritage and culture and basic contribution of those that came initially from Spain, and then the settlers that came up through Mexico with eventually the mixing of the blood.

At one point in time when these missions were first established, as those of New Mexico and California, this was not a part of the United States of America, but basically it was either New Spain, or subsequently, Mexico.

Then, through an accident of history, north of the Rio Grande and extending to the Pacific, those lands became part of the United States of America. So I think it is indeed well that we incorporate into our national patrimony now some of that contribution of the original Spaniards and the mixture thereof that eventually became the Hispanic.

Mr. Speaker, this is adjacent to and a segment of it will be in my congressional district. I think it is very appropriate that especially at this point in time, during Hispanic Heritage Month, that this legislation be approved here in the House and that we look back to the contributions of all who make the mosaic of what the American people are all about. But as far as we are concerned, the contributions from all who have come to this country have been legend.

Mr. Speaker, I think the preservation of what they left us is very important. This is one of those areas that was left to us basically by the Hispanic mixture as it first came from the Spanish and then all of the mixtures thereof.

I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] and commend him for working with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSTAMANTE] and the rest of the Texas delegation to see that these lands enhance the territory where the missions are so that it may be part of our national heritage.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize how invaluable the San Antonio Missions are as a part of our national historical and cultural heritage.

The San Antonio Missions are the most complete concentration of Spanish colonial structures in North America. They deserve to be preserved for all to enjoy.

For the legacy of the missions to continue, the national park containing them needs additional support.

The passage of H.R. 4811 will enable the park to protect additional archaeologically sensitive lands around the missions and develop the Park to its full tourist potential.

The San Antonio Missions National Historical Park is the 10th most popular visitor attraction in the State of Texas. However, without additional money for restoration the Park is in danger. There are eight diverse and significant cultural treasures within the park: Missions San Jose, Concepcion, Espada, and San Juan; the Espada Dam; the Aqueduct; and the San Juan and Espada Acequias.

Over 550,000 tourists visit the Park each year. They have contributed over \$250 million in tourist dollars to the economy of San Antonio in the last 5 years. But, most of these dollars have not been spent in the surrounding economically depressed area due to the lack of adequate tourist facilities.

With adequate funding the park could develop to its full potential and tourists would stay and spend their money in the mission district. The full developed tourism industry within the expanded park would provide the area

with much needed employment opportunities.

Please join me in voting for H.R. 4811. "Put a mission in your life."

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to comment, it was indeed gratifying to have the support and voice of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] added in recognition of this bill, not only as a sponsor, but as someone that shares hundreds of years of special heritage in his State and in America.

I do not know if Members of the House or the general public are aware of the distinguished role of the DE LA GARZA family in this Nation. When the noted novelist that wrote "Texas," Mr. Michener, was in the process of researching that acclaimed text, he actually interviewed our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], for that purpose.

I think that Members ought to recognize we have represented in the House Members who themselves represent not just the State of Texas, very well and their constituencies, but also represent something very special in terms of our national heritage. Certainly the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] is a wonderful illustration of that fact. So I am very proud of his support and interest, and the endorsement of the San Antonio Mission National Park Service expansion proposal before the House.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman BRUCE VENTO and his staff of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands for the exemplary work they have done in bringing H.R. 4811 to the floor. Let me also express the gratitude of the city of San Antonio, the San Antonio River Authority, Bexar County, the Archdiocese of San Antonio, and Los Compadres of San Antonio Missions for the committee's fine work on this bill.

And let me thank my colleagues Chairman E (KIKI) DE LA GARZA and Congressman LAMAR SMITH for their support as original co-sponsors of H.R. 4811. Their support has been invaluable in moving this legislation along.

Chairman BRUCE VENTO has guided this and many other bills like it carefully and quickly through the committee process. In so doing, he performs a great service to the country. Today, this body will help him in his mission to keep our National Park system strong by bringing some unprotected and valuable historic resources under the stewardship of the Federal Government.

H.R. 4811 is a simple, uncontroversial piece of legislation. As amended, the bill would do two things: First, expand the boundary of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park to protect critical historic resources; and second, raise the legislative ceiling on development of the park from \$500,000—set with the establishment of the park in 1978—to \$15 million.

The first part of the bill results from a boundary study done by the National Park Service [NPS], with extensive local participation, to determine the extent of protection needed for the lands already within this complex park and also to determine how much additional land should appropriately be brought under the aegis of the National Park Service.

The NPS has received universal acclaim from the citizens of San Antonio, historic preservation groups, and all local authorities for its boundary study work. Their recommendations, embodied in H.R. 4811, should be adopted immediately.

The second part of the bill is needed for any substantial development to take place at the San Antonio Missions. To date, only \$200,000 has been appropriated for development of essential public facilities at the park. The park has no visitors' center, and all public facilities there are woefully inadequate.

The private sector, the citizens of San Antonio, and all governmental entities in the area have been doing their part to protect, preserve, and promote the missions. It is now time for the Federal Government to do its part. We must raise the development ceiling on this park to the very reasonable level of \$15 million, a sum which was worked out by the committee and the National Park Service. This should allow for all development needs of the Missions Parks for the foreseeable future.

I thank the committee again for allowing me to submit these brief remarks. Finally, I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to support the fine work of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the National Park Service, and the concerned citizens of San Antonio. Vote aye on H.R. 4811.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4811, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING SEGMENTS OF LOWER MERCED RIVER AS COMPONENT OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4687) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the Lower Merced River in California as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4687

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF THE LOWER MERCED RIVER.

Section 39(a)(62) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(62)) is amended—

(1) by striking "The main stem" and inserting in lieu thereof "(A) The main stem";

(2) by striking "paragraph" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "subparagraph"; and

(3) by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(B) The main stem from a point 300 feet upstream of the confluence with Bear Creek downstream to the point of maximum flood control storage of Lake McClure (elevation 867 feet mean sea level), consisting of approximately 8 miles, as generally depicted on the map entitled 'Merced Wild and Scenic River', dated April 1990. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the segment designated under this subparagraph as recreational, from a point 300 feet upstream of the confluence with Bear Creek downstream to a point 300 feet west of the boundary of the Mountain King Mine, and as wild, from a point 300 feet west of the boundary of the Mountain King Mine to the point of maximum flood control storage of Lake McClure. With respect to the segment designated by this subparagraph, the requirements of subsection (b) of this section shall be fulfilled by the Secretary of the Interior through appropriate revisions to the Sierra Management Framework Plan for the Sierra Planning Area of the Folsom Resource area, Bakersfield District, Bureau of Land Management. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subparagraph."

SEC. 2. STUDY OF THE NORTH FORK OF THE MERCED RIVER.

Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)), is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"() NORTH FORK MERCED, CALIFORNIA.—The segment from its headwaters to its confluence with the Merced River."

SEC. 3. WITHDRAWAL FROM MINERAL ENTRY.

In the case of those segments on the main stem of the Merced River and on the South Fork Merced River which are designated as components of the wild and scenic river system pursuant to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and administered under that Act as recreational or scenic, all public lands within the authorized boundaries of such segments are withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws of the United States.

SEC. 4. SAXON CREEK PROJECT.

Nothing in the designation of the river segments referred to in section 1 of this Act as components of the National Wild and Scenic River Systems shall be construed to affect the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to permit the construction and operation of such pumping facilities and associated pipelines as identified in Bureau of Land Management right of way application CACA 26084, filed by the Mariposa County Water Agency on November 7, 1989, and known as the "Saxon Creek Project" to assure an adequate supply of water from the Merced River to Mariposa County, to the extent such construction and operation

are consistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4687 was introduced by Representative CONDIR, along with our colleague from California, Representative LEHMAN. The legislation, as amended, would provide for national wild and scenic river designation of 8 miles of the lower Merced River in California and a study of 15 miles of the north fork of the Merced. The lower Merced segment would join with 71 miles of the Merced River designated by Congress in 1987.

The Merced River offers excellent fishing as well as abundant and varied wildlife resources. Winding a course through a scenic canyon, the Merced draws significant public use to partake of its beauty and enjoy its high recreational values.

Public Law 100-49 designated a total of 114 miles of the main stem and south fork of the Merced as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. That act also provided for a study of the 8 miles of the Merced addressed by H.R. 4687 so that future water options could be explored.

In testimony before the committee, the administration testified that the lower Merced met wild and scenic river criteria. We also heard from local officials and conservation groups as to the river's values and the support that exists for its designation. This broad-based support was the result of considerable effort by the Bureau of Land Management, Mariposa County, and interested members of the public to fashion an acceptable proposal for the protection of the Merced's resource values.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us reflects the particular management

actions needed to both preserve and utilize this river in a responsible manner. The designation of these 8 miles of the Merced River will make a fine addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4687. This bill, which Mr. CONDIT and Mr. LEHMAN have brought before this body, represents an excellent example of cooperation among diverse interest groups. It is all to often that our subcommittee is forced to make a black or white choice between development and preservation. These choices are usually forced upon our committee because one party to a dispute adopts an all or nothing strategy, and succeeds in elevating the issue to a congressional forum.

Unfortunately, the committees of Congress are often not the best place to make such decisions. Rarely do the committees have the time necessary to devote a single topic, as in the case of the lower and merced river designation where local people have been working on the issue for about 5 years. And rarely do the committees of Congress have all the necessary information or the first hand resource knowledge, such as is the case here where local persons have intimate knowledge of the resource. In this particular case, a diverse group of local interests have come together and developed a solution which meets all of their needs and I commend the bill's sponsors for providing the opportunity for this locally based initiative to succeed. This measure is also significant in that it illustrates the flexibility inherent in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. This act was never intended by its authors to be an absolute preservation statute, but only designed to protect certain outstandingly remarkable resource values of certain river segments.

I recognize that on some issues of national importance or intense polarization, our subcommittee will have to step in. I hope that we in Congress can learn from this measure that micro-management of Federal lands from capitol hill should be the avenue of last resort, not the place where the issue should be first heard.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join the administration and me in supporting this measure.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering legislation, H.R. 4687, which would designate the lower 8 miles of the Merced River in California as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

This body will recall that legislation was introduced in 1987 by my predecessor, Tony Coelho, which proposed to designate 79 miles

of the main stem of the Merced River from its origins in Yosemite National Park to the Maxium control storage of Lake McClure as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. That legislation included the 8 miles of the lower Merced under consideration today.

Because of concerns expressed by local officials and the community in Mariposa County, that this inclusion would interfere with a potential water source, the final bill enacted by Congress in 1987 designated 71 miles, and required the Bureau of Land Management to study the designation of the lower 8 miles. I am pleased that the BLM released its study earlier this year, in which it recommended the inclusion of the lower 8 miles, with the act.

This bill is supported by the Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club and the Friends of the River. I am pleased also that, by and large, the local community supports this measure—the Mariposa County Board of Supervisors and the Merced Canyon Committee. Through negotiations with the committee, this measure address several local concerns by including a provision which authorizes the Secretary of Interior to approve the county's Saxon Creek project. This project will insure an adequate supply of water for Mariposa County and would not adversely impact the river.

I would like to thank Mr. VENTO, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, and his staff for working with the community in my district in order to ensure that the committee report contain language which clarifies several additional matters of concern. Specifically, the report contains language which specifies that this measure is not intended to impact existing mining claims nor the ability to Merced Irrigation District to administer its reservoir, Lake McClure, the point where the designation ends, during flood periods. The report also contains language providing that Congress has the option to revisit this designation in the event that a Yosemite Valley Railroad, which may run along a portion of the river's corridor, becomes feasible.

The Merced River is very special to my constituents, as well as to over the 1 million annual Yosemite National Park visitors. The river, also known as "Yosemite Valley's River," and its corridor are home for many rare birds and wildlife as well as many varieties of plants and flowers. This river also receives substantial recreational use, including rafting, hiking, camping, and picnicking. But the main reason I am sponsoring this legislation is to insure that this portion of the river is protected and preserved for our future generations. As we all know, there are few things of primitive natural beauty left here in our country. I believe this Congress should do all it can to protect them.

Again, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. VENTO, for his assistance on this measure, and to commend him for his persistence in moving it through the legislative process. I would also like to thank Mr. LEHMAN of California, for his support of and commitment to this measure which is another step in preserving and protecting the Merced.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4687, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMITH RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA ACT

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4309) to establish the Smith River National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4309

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Smith River National Recreation Area Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the Smith River, undammed and free-flowing from its headwaters to the Pacific Ocean, represents one of the last wholly intact vestiges of an invaluable legacy of wild and scenic rivers;

(2) the Smith River watershed, from the diverse conifer forests of the Siskiyou Mountains and unique botanical communities of the North Fork serpentine to the ancient redwoods along the river's lower reaches, exhibits a richness of ecological diversity unusual in a basin of its size;

(3) the Smith River watershed's scenic beauty, renowned anadromous fisheries, exceptional water quality, and abundant wildlife combine with its ready accessibility to offer exceptional opportunities for a wide range of recreational activities, including wilderness, water sports, fishing, hunting, camping, and sightseeing;

(4) careful development and utilization at mutually compatible levels of recreation, fisheries, and timber resources on public lands will ensure the continuation of the Smith River watershed's historic role as a significant contributor to the region's local economy; and

(5) protection of the Smith River's unique values can be enhanced by a cooperative effort by Federal, State and local governments to coordinate land-use planning, management, and development of Federal and non-Federal lands throughout the watershed.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "excluded area" means one of the four areas specifically excluded from the recreation area, as generally depicted on the map referred to in section 4(b);

(2) the term "forest plan" means the land and resource management plan for the Six Rivers National Forest prepared pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland

Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604);

(3) the term "recreation area" means the Smith River National Recreation Area established by section 4;

(4) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(5) the term "inner gorge" means the inherently unstable steep slope (65 percent gradient or more) immediately adjacent to the stream or river channel, extending from the channel or recent floodplain to the first significant break in slope (usually 15 percent or more).

SEC. 4. SMITH RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—For the purpose of ensuring the preservation, protection, enhancement, and interpretation for present and future generations of the Smith River watershed's outstanding wild and scenic rivers, ecological diversity, and recreation opportunities while providing for the wise use and sustained productivity of its natural resources, there is hereby established the Smith River National Recreation Area.

(b) **BOUNDARIES.**—(1) The recreation area shall consist of those lands within the area generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Smith River National Recreation Area" and dated July 1990. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture. The Secretary may, by publication of availability of a revised map and after public comment, make corrections or minor changes to the boundary of the recreation area.

(2) The exterior boundary of the recreation area, as generally depicted on the map, shall encompass the recreation area and the four excluded areas.

(c) **BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.**—The boundaries of the Six Rivers National Forest are hereby modified as generally depicted on the map referred to in subsection (b). A map and legal description of the boundary of the Six Rivers National Forest as modified by this subsection shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief, Forest Service, and the Office of the Forest Supervisor of the Six Rivers National Forest.

(d) **TRANSFER.**—The federally owned lands within the recreation area administered by the Secretary of the Interior on the date of enactment of this Act, comprising approximately 20 acres, are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and shall be managed in accordance with the laws applicable to the National Forest System and this Act.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall administer the recreation area in accordance with this Act and the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the National Forest System in furtherance of the purposes for which the recreation area was established. In administering the recreation area, the Secretary shall, consistent with the applicable area management emphasis provided under subsection (b), undertake the following:

(1) Provide for a broad range of recreation uses and provide recreational and interpretive services and facilities (including trails and campgrounds) for the public.

(2) Provide and maintain adequate public access, including vehicular roads for general recreational activities such as camping, hiking, hunting, and fishing.

(3) Improve the anadromous fishery and water quality, including (but not limited to)

stabilizing landslides, improving fish spawning and rearing habitat, and placing appropriate restrictions or limitations on soil disturbing activities.

(4) Permit the use of off-road vehicles only on designated routes.

(5) Provide for public health and safety and for the protection of the recreation area in the event of fire or infestation of insects or disease.

(6) Permit programmed and other timber harvest only in those management areas where timber harvest is specifically authorized by subsection (b). Timber management in these areas shall incorporate the use of strategies to reduce habitat fragmentation and employ silvicultural prescriptions designed to maintain or enhance biological diversity and wildlife habitats (such as retention of standing green trees, snags, and other coarse woody debris) by providing for a high level of structural and compositional diversity in managed stands.

(7) Prohibit timber harvest within streamside protection zones along those rivers and river segments specified in section 11 of this Act.

(8) Permit removal of trees in areas where timber harvest is not authorized only when necessary to maintain trails or existing roads, for human health and safety reasons, for the protection of the recreation area in the event of fire, for the development of recreation or other facilities, or to improve fish and wildlife habitat.

(9) Provide for the long-term viability and presence of Port-Orford-cedar and ensure its continued present economic and noneconomic uses through implementation of management strategies developed by the Forest Service.

(10) Protect, preserve, and increase old growth forest habitat in the recreation area.

(11) Provide for the restoration of landscapes damaged by past human activity consistent with the purposes of this Act.

(12) Develop a monitoring program to consistently gather water quality, air quality, wildlife, and fisheries data from representative Smith River subwatersheds within each management area.

(13) Develop and implement a management plan to maintain, protect, and promote habitat for native resident trout species in the recreation area.

(14) Cooperate with other Federal, State, and local government agencies in coordinating planning efforts throughout the Smith River watershed.

(b) **MANAGEMENT AREAS.**—(1) The recreation area shall contain eight management areas, as generally depicted on the map referred to in section 4(b). The Secretary may, pursuant to section 4(b), make minor revisions or amendments to the boundaries of the management areas.

(2) The Secretary shall administer each management area within the recreation area in accordance with the following:

(A) The management emphasis for the North Fork management area shall be on back-country and whitewater recreation, while recognizing unique botanic communities, outstanding whitewater, and historic and scenic values.

(B) The management emphasis for the Upper Middle Fork management area shall be on providing and maintaining ecologic and biologic diversity. Timber harvest shall be permitted, consistent with subsection (a)(6), only in existing plantations.

(C) The management emphasis for the Middle Fork-Highway 199 management area shall be on maintaining wildlife values and

providing for a full range of recreation uses, with particular emphasis on the scenic and recreation values associated with the Smith River, old growth redwoods, and California State Highway 199.

(D) The management emphasis for the Upper South Fork management area shall be on wild river and roadless back-country recreation.

(E) The management emphasis for the Lower South Fork management area shall be on maintaining and protecting natural scenic values in the river canyon while providing for traditional and compatible river sports, including white water rafting, angling, sightseeing, and developed and dispersed recreation. Timber harvests based on uneven-aged management with extended rotations shall be allowed where consistent with protection of the scenic values of the recreation area.

(F) The management emphasis for the Lower Hurdgurdy Creek management area shall be on maintenance of wildlife values while providing rustic family and group recreation facilities for fishing, swimming, hunting, and camping. Timber harvests based on uneven-aged management with extended rotations shall be allowed where consistent with protection of scenic and wildlife values.

(G) The management emphasis for the prescribed timber management area shall be on providing maximum sustainable yields of wood products consistent with subsection (a)(6).

(H) The management of the Siskiyou Wilderness management area shall be pursuant to the provisions of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.). The Gasquet-Orleans Road corridor between the eastern edge of section 36, T. 14 N., R. 3 E, and the corridor's eastern terminus in the middle of section 26, T. 14 N., R. 4 E. shall be added to the Siskiyou Wilderness.

(c) **WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.**—The river segments designated as wild and scenic rivers by the amendments made by section 8(b) of this Act shall be administered in accordance with this Act and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.). In case of conflict between the provisions of these Acts, the more restrictive provision shall apply.

SEC. 6. ACQUISITION AND DISPOSAL OF LANDS AND OTHER PROPERTY.

(a) **ACQUISITION.**—The Secretary is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise lands, waters, or interests therein (including scenic or other easements), and structures or other improvements thereon, within the boundaries of the recreation area as the Secretary determines appropriate for the purposes of this Act. In exercising this authority, the Secretary is directed to give prompt and careful consideration to any offer to sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of such property made by an individual or organization. The Secretary shall not acquire any land or interest in land owned by the State of California or any of its political subdivisions within the recreation area except by donation or exchange. All lands acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this Act shall be subject to the laws and regulations pertaining to the National Forest System and this Act.

(b) **TRANSFERS TO DEL NORTE COUNTY.**—(1) Upon the adoption of a resolution by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Del Norte, California, accepting title to the lands described in paragraph (2) and subject to the County of Del Norte bearing the cost

of the survey of such lands, the Secretary shall transfer all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands described in paragraph (2).

(2) The lands referred to in paragraph (1) are described as follows:

(A) Lands north of tract 37, T. 17 N., R. 3 E., H.M., containing 6 acres, more or less, and more particularly described as:

Commencing at the N.E. corner of tract 37, T. 17 N., R. 3 E., H.M.; thence, northerly on a line continuing the eastern boundary of said tract 37 to a point where it intersects the southern boundary of the easement for State highway conveyed to the State of California, Department of Transportation, on the 17th day of May 1977, and recorded on June 22, 1977 at book 206 of Official Records, page 256; thence, southwesterly along the southern boundary of said easement to the point where it intersects the northern boundary of said tract 37; thence, easterly along the northern boundary of said tract 37 to the point of beginning.

(B) Lands east of tract 37, T. 17 N., R. 3 E., H.M., containing 6 acres, more or less, and more particularly described as:

Commencing at a point on the eastern boundary of tract 37, T. 17 N., R. 3 E., H.M., lying 332 feet southerly of the N.E. corner of said tract 37; thence, due east to the high water line of the Middle Fork of the Smith River; thence, southwesterly along the high water line of the Middle Fork of the Smith River to its intersection with the northern boundary of tract 38, T. 17 N., R. 3 E.; thence, westerly along the northern boundary of said tract 38 to its intersection with said tract 37; thence, northerly along the eastern boundary of said tract 37 to the point of beginning.

(c) CONDITIONS OF TRANSFER.—Transfer of the lands and interests described in subsection (b)(2) of this section shall be subject to the condition that all right, title, and interest therein shall revert to the United States if the county of Del Norte, California, attempts to transfer any portion of such lands to any other entity or person or if Del Norte County permits any portion of such lands to be used for any purpose incompatible with the purposes of this Act. The Secretary shall include in any document of conveyance whereby such lands are transferred to the county of Del Norte appropriate provisions to implement this subsection.

(d) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all public lands within the recreation area are hereby withdrawn from entry, sale, or other disposition under the public land laws of the United States. This subsection shall not affect the exchange authorities of the Secretary.

SEC. 7. FISH AND GAME.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State of California with respect to fish and wildlife, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping on any lands managed by the Secretary under this Act, except that the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting, fishing, or trapping shall be permitted for reasons of protecting nongame species and their habitats, public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulation of the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be put into effect only after consultation with the fish and wildlife agency of the State of California.

SEC. 8. MINERALS.

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—Federal lands within the exterior boundary of the recreation area

are hereby withdrawn from all forms of location, entry, and patent under the United States mining laws and from disposition under the mineral leasing laws, including all laws pertaining to geothermal leasing.

(b) PATENTS.—Patents may not be issued under the mining laws of the United States after the date of enactment of this Act for locations and claims made before the date of enactment of this Act on Federal lands located within the exterior boundaries of the recreation area.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Except for extraction of common variety minerals such as stone, sand, and gravel for use in construction and maintenance of roads and other facilities within the recreation area and the excluded areas, all other mineral development on federally owned lands within the recreation area is prohibited.

SEC. 9. MANAGEMENT PLANNING.

The Secretary shall revise the document entitled "Smith River National Recreation Area Management Plan" dated February 1990 to conform to the provisions of this Act, and such revised plan shall guide management of the recreation area and shall be incorporated in its entirety into the forest plan for the Six Rivers National Forest. This incorporation shall not be deemed a revision or amendment to the forest plan for purposes of the section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974. The Secretary shall make such further revisions to the management plan as are necessary in order to include more specific development and use plans for the recreation areas. Such revisions shall be made no later than 5 years after the enactment of this Act. Such revisions and any other modifications of the management plan shall be made only through the processes of revisions or amendment of the forest plan pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, including appropriate consultation with State and local government officials and provisions for full public participation considering the views of all interested parties, organization, and individuals.

SEC. 10. WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.

(a) PREVIOUS DESIGNATIONS.—Previous designations dated January 19, 1981, by the Secretary of the Interior (46 Fed. Reg. 7483-84) under section 2(a)(ii) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1273) of rivers within the exterior boundary of the recreation area are superseded by this Act.

(b) DESIGNATIONS.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"() SMITH RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The segment from the confluence of the Middle Fork Smith River and the South Fork Smith River to the Six Rivers National Forest boundary, including the following segments of the mainstream and certain tributaries, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The segment from the confluence of the Middle Fork Smith River and the South Fork Smith River to the National Forest boundary, as a recreational river.

"(B) Rowdy Creek from the California-Oregon State line to the National Forest boundary, as a recreational river.

"() MIDDLE FORK SMITH RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The segment of the mainstream and certain tributaries, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The segment from its headwaters about 3 miles south of Sanger Lake, as depicted on the 1956 USGS 15' Preston Peak topographic map, to the center of section 7, T. 17 N., R. 5 E., as a wild river.

"(B) The segment from the center of section 7, T. 17 N., R. 5 E., to the center of section 6, T. 17 N., R. 5 E., as a scenic river.

"(C) The segment from the center of section 6, T. 17 N., R. 5 E., to one-half mile upstream from its confluence with Knopki Creek, as a wild river.

"(D) The segment from one-half mile upstream of its confluence with Knopki Creek to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(E) Myrtle Creek from its headwaters in section 9, T. 17 N., R. 1 E., as depicted on the 1952 USGS 15' Crescent City topographic map, to the middle of section 28, T. 17 N., R. 1 E., as scenic river.

"(F) Myrtle Creek from the middle of section 28, T. 17 N., R. 1 E., to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, as a wild river.

"(G) Shelly Creek from its headwaters in section 1, T. 18 N., R. 3 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with Patrick Creek, as a recreational river.

"(H) Kelly Creek from its headwaters in section 32, T. 17 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, as a scenic river.

"(I) Packsaddle Creek from its headwaters about 0.8 miles southwest of Broken Rib Mountain, as depicted on the 1956 USGS 15' Preston Peak topographic map, to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, as a scenic river.

"(J) East Fork Patrick Creek from its headwaters in section 10, T. 18 N., R. 3 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with the West Fork of Patrick Creek, as a recreational river.

"(K) West Fork Patrick Creek from its headwaters in section 18, T. 18 N., R. 3 E., as depicted on the 1951 15' Gasquet topographic map to its confluence with the East Fork Patrick Creek, as a recreational river.

"(L) Little Jones Creek from its headwaters in section 34, T. 17 N., R. 3 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(M) Griffin Creek from its headwaters about 0.2 miles southwest of Hazel View Summit, as depicted on the 1956 USGS 15' Preston Peak topographic map, to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(N) Knopki Creek from its headwaters about 0.4 mile west of Sanger Peak, as depicted on the 1956 USGS 15' Preston Peak topographic map, to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(O) Monkey Creek from its headwaters in the northeast quadrant of section 12, T. 18 N., R. 3 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(P) Patrick Creek from the junction of East and West Forks of Patrick Creek to its confluence with Middle Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(Q) Hardscrabble Creek from its headwaters in the northeast quarter of section 2, T. 17 N., R. 1 E., as depicted on the 1952 USGS 15' Crescent City topographic map, to its

confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"() NORTH FORK SMITH RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The segment from the California-Oregon State line to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, including the following segments of the mainstream and certain tributaries, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The segment from the California-Oregon State line to its confluence with an unnamed tributary in the northeast quarter of section 5, T. 18 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, as a wild river.

"(B) The segment from its confluence with an unnamed tributary in the northeast quarter of section 5, T. 18 N., R. 2 E., to its southern-most intersection with the eastern section line of section 5, T. 18 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, as a scenic river.

"(C) The segment from its southern-most intersection with the eastern section line of section 5, T. 18 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with Stony Creek, as a wild river.

"(D) The segment from its confluence with Stony Creek to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(E) Diamond Creek from California-Oregon State line to its confluence with Bear Creek, as a recreational river.

"(F) Diamond Creek from its confluence with Bear Creek to its confluence with the North Fork Smith River, as a scenic river.

"(G) Bear Creek from its headwaters in section 24, T. 18 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with Diamond Creek, as a scenic river.

"(H) Still Creek from its headwaters in section 11, T. 18 N., R. 1 E., as depicted on the 1952 USGS 15' Crescent City topographic map, to its confluence with the North Fork Smith River, as a scenic river.

"(I) North Fork Diamond Creek from the California-Oregon State line to its confluence with Diamond Creek, as a recreational river.

"(J) High Plateau Creek from its headwaters in section 26, T. 18 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with Diamond Creek, as a scenic river.

"(K) Stony Creek from its headwaters in section 25, T. 18 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with the North Fork Smith River, as a scenic river.

"(L) Peridotite Creek from its headwaters in section 34, T. 18 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with the North Fork Smith River, as a wild river.

"() SISKIYOU FORK SMITH RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The segment from its headwaters to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, and the following tributaries, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The segment from its headwaters about 0.7 miles southeast of Broken Rib Mountain, as depicted on the 1956 USGS 15' Preston Peak Topographic map, to its confluence with the South Siskiyou Fork Smith River, as a wild river.

"(B) The segment from its confluence with South Siskiyou Fork Smith River to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(C) South Siskiyou Fork Smith River from its headwaters about 0.6 miles southwest of Buck Lake, as depicted on the 1956 USGS 15' Preston Peak topographic map, to its confluence with the Siskiyou Fork Smith River, as a wild river.

"() SOUTH FORK SMITH RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The segment from its headwaters to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, and the following tributaries, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The segment from its headwaters about 0.5 miles southwest of Bear Mountain, as depicted on 1956 USGS 15' Preston Peak topographic map, to Blackhawk Bar, as a wild river.

"(B) The segment from Blackhawk Bar to its confluence with the Middle Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(C) William Creek from its headwaters in section 31, T. 14 N., R. 4 E., as depicted on the 1952 USGS 15' Sip Mountain topographic map, to its confluence with Eight Mile Creek, as a wild river.

"(D) Eight Mile Creek from its headwaters in section 29, T. 14 N., R. 4 E., as depicted on the 1955 USGS 15' Dillon Mtn. topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a wild river.

"(E) Harrington Creek from its source to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a wild river.

"(F) Prescott Fork of the Smith River from its headwaters about 0.5 miles southeast of Island Lake, as depicted on the 1955 USGS 15' Dillon Mtn. topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a wild river.

"(G) Quartz Creek from its headwaters in section 31, T. 16 N., R. 4 E., as depicted on the 1952 15' USGS Ship Mountain topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(H) Jones Creek from its headquarters in section 36, T. 16 N., R. 3 E., as depicted on the 1952 USGS 15' Ship Mountain topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(I) Hurdgyurdy Creek from its headwaters about 0.4 miles southwest of Bear Basin Butte as depicted on the 1956 USGS 15' Preston Peak topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(J) Gordon Creek from its headwaters in section 18, T. 16 N., R. 3 E., as depicted on 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(K) Coon Creek from the junction of its two headwaters tributaries in the southeast quadrant of section 31, T. 17 N., R. 3 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(L) Craigs Creek from its headwaters in section 36, T. 17 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1951 USGS 15' Gasquet topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(M) Goose Creek from its headwaters in section 13, T. 13 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1952 USGS 15' Shop Mountain topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(N) East Fork Goose Creek from its headwaters in section 18, T. 13 N., R. 3 E., as depicted on the 1952 USGS 15' Ship Mountain topographic map, to its confluence with Goose Creek, as a recreational river.

"(O) Buck Creek from its headwaters at Cedar Camp Spring, as depicted on the 1952 USGS 15' Ship Mountain topographic map, to the northeast corner of section 8, T. 14 N., R. 3 E., as a scenic river.

"(P) Buck Creek from the northeast corner of section 8, T. 14 N., R. 3 E., to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a wild river.

"(Q) Muzzleloader Creek from its headwaters in section 2, T. 15 N., R. 3 E., as depicted on the 1952 USGS 15' Ship Mountain topographic map, to its confluence with Jones Creek, as a recreational river.

"(R) Canthook Creek from its headwaters in section 2, T. 15 N., R. 2 E., as depicted in the 1952 USGS 15' Shop Mountain topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(S) Rock Creek from the national forest boundary in section 6, T. 15 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1952 USGS 15' Ship Mountain topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a recreational river.

"(T) Blackhawk Creek from its headwaters in section 21, T. 15 N., R. 2 E., as depicted on the 1952 USGS 15' Ship Mountain topographic map, to its confluence with the South Fork Smith River, as a recreational river."

(c) MANAGEMENT.—The management plan prepared under section 9 of this Act shall be deemed to satisfy the requirement for a comprehensive management plan required under section 3(d)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

SEC. 11. STREAMSIDE PROTECTION ZONES.

(a) For each of the rivers and river segments specified in this subsection, there is hereby established a streamside protection zone in which timber harvesting shall be prohibited. Such zone shall extend 300 feet from each bank of the rivers and river segments, or 100 feet from the inner gorge of said rivers and river segments, or within the limit of high and extreme landslide hazards on said rivers and river segments, whichever is greater. The provisions of this subsection shall apply to the following rivers and river segments:

(1) Rowdy Creek (from California-Oregon border to NRA boundary).

(2) Shelly Creek (from its headwaters to Patrick Creek).

(3) East Fork Patrick Creek (from its headwaters to Patrick Creek).

(4) West Fork Patrick Creek (from its headwaters to Patrick Creek).

(5) Little Jones Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(6) Patrick Creek (from the confluence of the East and West forks of Patrick Creek to the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(7) Monkey Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(8) Hardscrabble Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(9) Quartz Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(10) Jones Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(11) Upper Hurdgyurdy Creek (from its headwaters to Dry Lake).

(12) Gordon Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(13) Coon Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(14) Craigs Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(15) Goose Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(16) East Fork of Goose Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with Goose Creek).

(17) Muzzleloader Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with Jones Creek).

(18) Canthook Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(19) Rock Creek (from the NRA boundary to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(20) Blackhawk Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(b) For each of the rivers and river segments specified in this subsection there is established a streamside protection zone in which timber harvesting shall be prohibited. Such zone shall extend on either side of said rivers and river segments, or 100 feet from the inner gorge of said rivers and river segments, or within the limit of high and extreme landslide hazards on said rivers and river segments, whichever is greater. The provisions of this subsection shall apply to the following rivers and river segments:

(1) Main stem Smith (from the South Fork to the NRA boundary).

(2) Middle Fork Smith (from its headwaters to its confluence with the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(3) Myrtle Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(4) Kelly Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(5) Packsaddle Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(6) Griffin Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(7) Knopli Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(8) North Fork of the Smith River (from the California/Oregon border to its confluence with the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(9) Diamond Creek (from the California/Oregon border to its confluence with the North Fork of the Smith River).

(10) Bear Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with Diamond Creek).

(11) Still Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the North Fork of the Smith River).

(12) North Fork of Diamond Creek (from the California/Oregon border to its confluence with Diamond Creek).

(13) High Plateau Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with Diamond Creek).

(14) Stony Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the North Fork of the Smith River).

(15) Peridotite Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the North Fork of the Smith River).

(16) Siskiyou Fork, Smith River (from its headwaters to the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(17) South Siskiyou Fork of the Smith River (from its headwaters to its confluence with the Siskiyou Fork of the Smith River).

(18) South Fork Smith River (from its headwaters to its confluence with the Middle Fork of the Smith River).

(19) Williams Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(20) Eight Mile Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(21) Harrington Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(22) Prescott Fork of the Smith River (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(23) Buck Creek (from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River).

(c) For the Lower Hurdycurdy Creek (from Dry Lake to its confluence with the South Fork of the Smith River) there is established a streamside protection zone in which timber harvesting shall be prohibited. Such zone shall extend one-eighth mile on either side of said Lower Hurdycurdy Creek.

(d) The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in lieu of, any restrictions on timber harvesting or other activities applicable to the streamside protection zones established by this section under any other applicable provision of this Act.

SEC. 12. STATE AND LOCAL JURISDICTION AND ASSISTANCE.

(a) STATE AND LOCAL JURISDICTION.—Nothing in this Act shall diminish, enlarge, or modify any right of the State of California or any political subdivision thereof, to exercise civil and criminal jurisdiction or to carry out State fish and game laws, rules, and regulations within the recreation area, or to tax persons, franchise, or private property on the lands and waters included in the recreation area, or to regulate the private lands within the recreation area.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary is authorized and encouraged to enter into cooperative agreements with the State of California or its political subdivisions for—

(1) the rendering on a reimbursable basis, of rescue, firefighting, and law enforcement services and cooperative assistance by nearby law enforcement and fire prevention agencies; and

(2) the planning for use, management, and development of non-Federal lands within the recreation area and elsewhere in the Smith River watershed in the furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—To enable the State of California and its political subdivisions to develop and implement programs compatible with the purposes of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretaries of the Interior, Commerce, and Housing and Urban Development, shall consider upon request such technical assistance to the State and its political subdivisions as is necessary to fulfill the purposes of this section. Such assistance may include payments or grants, within existing programs, for technical aid and program development.

(d) LAND INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall assist the county of Del Norte in developing a land information system that will be compatible with the Forest Service and National Park Service systems for the Federal lands in Del Norte County and such non-Federal systems as may be appropriate and that will be made available to Federal and non-Federal entities for use in coordinating planning for the recreation area and other lands in the Smith River watershed.

SEC. 13. SAVING PROVISIONS.

(a) ACTIVITIES ON LANDS OUTSIDE OF RECREATION AREA.—Nothing in this Act shall limit, restrict, or require specific management practices on lands outside the recreation area boundary. The fact that activities or uses outside the recreation area can be seen, heard, or otherwise perceived within the recreation area shall not, of itself, limit, restrict, or preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the recreation area.

(b) PRIOR RIGHTS.—(1) Nothing in this Act shall limit, restrict, or preclude the implementation of valid timber sale contracts or other contracts or agreements executed by the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Except as specifically provided herein nothing in this Act shall be construed as diminishing or relinquishing any right, title, or interest of the United States in any lands, waters, or interests therein within the boundaries of the recreation area designated by this Act.

(c) ROAD EASEMENTS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the responsibilities of the State of California or any of its political subdivisions with respect to road easements, including maintenance and improvement of State Highway 199 and County Route 427.

(d) RIGHTS OF ACCESS.—Existing rights provided by Federal law for access by private landowners across National Forest System lands shall not be affected by this Act.

(e) ENTITLEMENT MONIES.—Annually for the first five full fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall pay for use by units of local government within the recreation area an amount equal to the difference between the amounts payable for such purposes pursuant to the Act of May 23, 1908 (chapter 193; 35 Stat. 251; 16 U.S.C. 500) and the average amount paid for such purpose under such Act during the five fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this Act. The amount payable under this subsection shall be reduced by 10 percent annually commencing the sixth fiscal year and 10 percent annually thereafter for each succeeding fiscal year until the amount payable shall be reduced 100 percent by the end of the fifteenth fiscal year after the date of enactment. This subsection shall expire 14 years after the first payment pursuant to this subsection.

SEC. 14. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4309 as reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

This bill would provide for designation of the Smith River National Recreation Area within the Six Rivers National Forest in Del Norte County, CA. It would also statutorily designate a number of segments of the Smith River and its tributaries for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Mr. Speaker, the area covered by this bill is in extreme northwestern California. The Smith River is the last major undammed river in the State, and is characterized by exceptionally clear water, a vigorous anadromous fishery, and steep, forested mountains. The area exhibits tremendous diversity, including lush coastal redwood forests, dense stands of mixed conifers and hardwoods, sparsely vegetated high elevation plateaus, and high mountain peaks and meadows.

The area includes one of the best salmon and steelhead fisheries on the west coast, with 176 miles of anadromous fish habitat and 114 miles available to anglers seeking quiet and solitude while fishing for native trout. The six lakes in the NRA range in size from 0.7 to 6.1 acres, and are stocked with rainbow or brook trout by the California Department of Fish and Game. In addition, 300 species of wildlife occur in the area.

The provisions of this bill designating a Smith River National Recreation Area and designating a number of river segments for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System generally correspond to proposals documented in a forest service management plan in February 1990.

The river segments that the bill would designate include the three main forks of the Smith River, numerous tributaries, and a short segment of the main stem. These rivers and tributaries were listed in the nationwide rivers inventory conducted by the National Park Service. These same rivers are part of the California Wild and Scenic River System.

In July 1980, the Governor of California petitioned the Secretary of the Interior to include these rivers and tributaries in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System under section 2(A)(II) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. A decision on January 19, 1981, by the Secretary of the Interior added the rivers and tributaries to the na-

tional system. The bill would give that status a statutory confirmation.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the bill would establish streamside protection zones, where timber harvest would be prohibited, for certain specified streams within the Smith River Basin, and would adjust the boundaries of the Six Rivers National Forest so as to exclude certain private lands now within those boundaries. The bill also includes provisions dealing with the status of some Federal lands that for many years have been used by the county for public purposes, and imposes restrictions on mineral development within the national recreation area.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for a transitional period during which local governments in the area would be given assurance against possible reductions in payments under existing laws that tie such payments to Federal timber receipts. This provision would supplement such payments, to bring them up to an amount based on the average payment made during the last 5 years, should that be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and one that reflects great credit on the gentleman from California [Mr. Bosco], who has worked so long and hard and has exercised such leadership in putting together a proposal that enjoys such well-deserved support. I want to highly commend him for this achievement, which deserves the overwhelming approval of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Smith River is clearly one of the crown jewels of Western rivers. In fact, it is the last major river in California that is completely free of dams and diversions. This area is rich in spectacular scenery and abounds in fish and wildlife. It has long been one of California's prime recreation attractions.

There has been considerable controversy concerning the proper approach for protecting the Smith River. Some have suggested that some sort of designation managed by the National Park Service might be most appropriate. However, because of the sharp increase in tourism promised by supporters of an expanded Redwood National Park that never materialized, local residents were not enthralled with the idea of having an additional unit of the National Park Service in their backyard.

As a result, Congressman Doug Bosco took it upon himself to work with a broad cross section of local people and groups to design a protection plan for the Smith River that everyone could live with comfortably. H.R. 4309 is the final product of a long and perhaps painful process at times

that included the Forest Service, local government, conservationists, and the timber industry.

I know that during the relatively short time between the hearing by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands and markup by the full Interior Committee, we saw a number of different versions of the bill. As a result, I can only imagine that numerous changes took place in this bill during months Mr. Bosco and his constituents have worked on it.

H.R. 4309 would create a national recreation area of about 300,000 acres to be managed by the Forest Service. Although most of this area will be managed primarily for noncommodity uses such as recreation and fish and wildlife habitat, a significant area is dedicated for timber harvest under prudent management.

Moreover, this legislation would add several important tributaries of the Smith River as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System that were not included in the original designations made nearly 10 years ago. It also upgrades the classification of several other rivers that were previously designated.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that although the administration generally supports this bill, they have three major objections.

They are the prohibition on most timber harvest within the corridors of designated wild and scenic rivers and making Federal payments to local counties totaling \$10 million.

However, perhaps the greatest objection the administration has deals with prohibiting mining on valid existing claims. The statements on administration policy regarding this provision states:

The Secretary of Agriculture would be required to compensate existing claimants for this taking of their private property rights. There are over 5,000 claims within the boundary of the proposed national recreation area. One firm alone has spent approximately \$20 million just on mineral documentation. While the Department of Agriculture does not have an estimate of the value of these mining claims, such compensation would be very costly.

I am optimistic that all three of these concerns can be ironed out in the Senate during the remaining days of the 101st Congress.

□ 1340

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Bosco], the architect of this bill.

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of H.R. 4309, my legislation that would establish a National Recreation Area encompassing the national forest

lands in the Smith River watershed in California.

H.R. 4309 will establish a 300,000-acre National Recreation Area in the heart of the Six Rivers National Forest in Del Norte County. The bill is the product of many months of painstaking work with the Forest Service, representatives of local government, environmental groups and the timber industry, to produce a proposal that will provide permanent protection for the "crown jewel" of California's wild and scenic rivers. I particularly want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, Mr. VENTO, and his staff, for their assistance and support in developing the bill before the House today.

The Smith River and its tributaries comprise the only remaining watershed in California that is completely free of dams and diversions. Its clear waters, spectacular scenery and abundant fish and wildlife have long made it one of the California's premiere recreation attractions. Its rich forests have produced more than a billion board feet of timber over the past four decades. But the resources that make the Smith River such a uniquely valuable part of our natural heritage have also made it a magnet for controversy. Proposals that have been advanced in recent years run the gamut from large-scale strip mining and increased logging to creation of a national park. After the bitter battles over expansion of Redwood National Park in 1978 and the California Wilderness Act in 1984, I think we're all ready to end this controversy.

This legislation represents our best efforts to produce a plan that will guarantee the protection of the values that make the Smith River such a special place while enhancing its recreational potential and ensuring the sustained productivity of its renewable resources.

In many ways, the challenges we faced in developing this proposal mirror the challenges facing the national forest system as a whole. To the extent we are successful, I believe it could provide a model for responding to the conflicts confronting us in the future management of highly sensitive lands throughout the national forests.

Although the general effect and intent of this bill is to shift the overall management emphasis of Six Rivers National Forest's Gasquet Ranger District more toward recreation, the underlying land allocations and prescriptions have largely been determined by the physical character of the watershed itself and the ecological systems it supports.

The result is a comprehensive, ecologically based management strategy that will provide for a wide range of uses in the Smith River watershed with a minimum of conflicts.

The heaviest recreation use has been and will continue to be focused along the river's Middle Fork adjacent to Highway 199, along the Lower South Fork and in the lower Hurdygurdy Creek areas. The Forest Service's draft management plan calls for additional camping facilities and trails, improved boating and fishing access and expanded information and interpretive services in these areas.

More primitive recreation opportunities are available in the Siskiyou Wilderness and the truly wild rivers of the North Fork and Upper South Fork. Those areas will remain much the way they are today, with the exception of river access and trail improvements.

The primary emphasis in the Upper Middle Fork area will be on maintaining ecological diversity through preservation of remaining old growth timber and sensitive management of existing young plantations.

Future timber harvests will for the most part be limited to the Prescribed Timber Management Area, which primarily includes lands in the higher central part of the watershed where extensive logging has already occurred and road systems are in place. This area includes substantial acreage in private ownership which I believe the Forest Service should be encouraged to acquire from willing sellers either by purchase or exchange to enhance the NRA's long-term timber production potential.

The bill specifically requires the use of "new forestry" techniques and maintenance of biological diversity in areas subject to timber management. I believe this is one of the crucial challenges facing public land managers today, and I hope the Forest Service will take advantage of this opportunity to make this a model for testing and development of alternative silvicultural strategies.

Wildlife considerations, including the needs of spotted owls and other sensitive species, have been integrated into the plan throughout the NRA through the protection of large blocks of habitat and connecting corridors. I believe this plan provides a biologically sound framework for future management of the spotted owl, and I hope that consideration will be given to modifications to the boundaries of the proposed Habitat Conservation Area that would more closely reflect the land allocations contained in this bill.

The measure also adds to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System several important tributaries that were left out of former Secretary Andrus' original designation and upgrades the classification of several other streams that are already protected.

The legislation would prohibit mining on Federal lands within the recreation area.

The bill also contains several important provisions intended to address Del Norte County's concerns about the impact of the NRA's establishment on local government finances, correct a historic survey error and ensure coordination of planning efforts throughout the watershed.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there are those in the environmental community and the timber industry who will say that this bill goes too far or not far enough in protecting the Smith River. But I believe this is a responsible legislative solution that all parties can live with and one that enjoys broad support among the general public. I would appreciate my colleagues' support in helping to enact H.R. 4309 into law this year.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the Smith River in northern California tumbles unfettered through steep canyons from the coastal mountains into the Pacific Ocean. There are magnificent stands of old growth redwood and Douglas fir trees. The legislation we are considering today will preserve much of the greatness and wildness of the Smith River.

The legislation protects more than 14,000 acres of old growth forest. The bill closes more than half of the 305,000 acres in the national recreation area to logging. The act calls for rehabilitating landscapes and watersheds damaged by past logging and mining activities.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect bill. There are areas that should be included in the ban on cutting. These include the Lower South Fork Management Area, the Lower Hurdygurdy Creek Management Area, and Muslatt Mountain. However, other areas that are set aside for logging have little scenic or wildlife value. Some of these areas have already been heavily logged.

However, in spite of the problems, there is a broad coalition of support from the environmental community, local officials and the major timber companies to pass the bill. We have an opportunity to preserve a splendid area in northern California for future generations to enjoy. We should act now.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 4309, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING A MEMORIAL AT CUSTER BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4660) to authorize the establishment of a memorial at Custer Battlefield National Monument to honor the Indians who fought in the Battle of the Little Bighorn, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4660

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) a monument was erected in 1881 at Last Stand Hill to commemorate the soldiers, scouts, and civilians attached to the 7th United States Cavalry who fell in the Battle of the Little Bighorn;

(2) while many members of the Cheyenne, Sioux, and other Indian Nations gave their lives defending their families and traditional lifestyle and livelihood, nothing stands at the battlefield to commemorate those individuals; and

(3) the public interest will best be served by establishing a memorial at the Custer Battlefield National Monument to honor the Indian participants in the battle.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF MEMORIAL.

In order to honor and recognize the Indians who fought to preserve their land and culture in the Battle of the Little Bighorn, to provide visitors with an improved understanding of the events leading up to and the consequences of the fateful battle, and to encourage peace and brotherhood among people of all races, the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to design, construct, and maintain a memorial at the Custer Battlefield National Monument.

SEC. 3. SITE, DESIGN, AND PLANS FOR MEMORIAL.

(a) **SITE.**—The Secretary is authorized and directed to select a suitable area for the memorial authorized by section 2. Such area shall be located on the ridge in that part of the Little Bighorn Battlefield which is in the vicinity of the 7th United States Cavalry Monument, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Indian Memorial Site Alternatives, Custer Battlefield National Monument", numbered 80,050, and dated June 1989.

(b) **DESIGN AND PLANS.**—The Secretary is authorized to hold a competition to select the design of the memorial authorized by section 2. The design and plans for the memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary.

(c) **CONSULTATION.**—In selecting a site and design for the memorial authorized by section 2, the Secretary shall provide for the public input from interested members of the public, including the Indian Memorial Committee, appointed by the Rocky Mountain Regional Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 4. DONATIONS OF FUNDS, PROPERTY, AND SERVICES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept and expend donations of funds, property, or services from individuals, foundations, corporations, or public entities for the purpose of provid-

ing for the memorial authorized by section 2.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4660, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4660 was introduced by our colleague Representative RON MARLENEE, along with Representative CAMPBELL of Colorado, Representative UDALL, and Representative WILLIAMS. The legislation authorizes the establishment of a memorial at Custer Battlefield National Monument to commemorate the Indians who fought to preserve their land and culture at the Battle of the Little Bighorn in 1876.

While many know of Custer's last stand, far fewer know of the circumstances or events that led to this momentous encounter at Little Bighorn. For a time that story only centered on the daring and flamboyancy of Lt. Col. George Armstrong Custer who led his men into a fateful battle that proved to be the high water mark of the Plains Indians struggle. Looking back today we can see a story of sacrifice and bravery on both sides. The Indian memorial authorized by H.R. 4660 is meant to give recognition to the Indians who fought there, just as the existing Seventh Cavalry Monument recognizes U.S. Army participants.

There is significant public interest in this legislative proposal, especially from members of the Indian community, who have felt that such recognition was long overdue. This project was developed with significant public input, including the participation of an Indian memorial committee appointed by the National Park Service in 1989. The legislation provides for a continuation of this public participation process in finalizing the placement and

design of an Indian memorial at the battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, there is a general consensus that H.R. 4660, as amended, is a good proposal that will provide tangible recognition of Indian involvement in the Battle of the Little Bighorn. I know of no controversy with the erection of this memorial and I urge adoption of the legislation by the House.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to bring to this august body H.R. 4660 that, at last will give recognition to the fallen Indian warriors of the most famous battle ever fought in the Indian wars—the Battle of the Little Bighorn.

Lt. Col. George Armstrong Custer has long been honored along with his forces who died in this battle at what is now known as the Custer Battlefield National Monument. In 1881, the U.S. Government erected a monument over the mass grave-site on Last Stand Hill for soldiers, scouts, and civilians attached to the 7th Cavalry who died there.

On a scorching June Sunday in 1876, hundreds of Indian warriors converged on a grassy ridge rising above the valley of Montana's Little Bighorn River. On the ridge, 5 companies of U.S. cavalry, about 225 officers and troopers, fought desperately but hopelessly against many times their number. When the guns fell silent and the smoke and dust of battle lifted, no soldier survived.

This was "The Battle of the Little Bighorn"—a spectacular triumph for the American Indian, but one that for too long has not been properly recognized.

This legislation today will begin to restore historical balance to the battle. While many members of the Cheyenne, Sioux, and other Indian nations gave their lives defending their families and their traditional lifestyle and livelihood, nothing stands at the battlefield to commemorate those individuals.

This legislation will authorize a memorial at Custer Battlefield to honor the many members of the Cheyenne, Sioux, and other Indian Nations that gave their lives defending their land, families, culture, and livelihood in the Battle of the Little Bighorn.

This legislation will do more than bring recognition to one group of courageous Indians. This year marks the 100th anniversary of the last battle fought by the Indians—the Battle of Wounded Knee. And, with the theme of "Peace Through Unity," this memorial recognizes that only through peaceful relationships among people of all races can our Nation achieve the unity that is so vital to continued strength and prosperity.

I wish to note that the entire State of Montana stands to benefit from erection of this memorial. Its establishment will further enhance the already worldwide and national significance of Custer Battlefield National Monument, increasing its drawing power as a major historical site in the United States.

Because of its significance in Indian history as the site of the last major victory by the Indians, Custer Battlefield has long deserved the recognition it has received. Now, with the establishment of this memorial, its importance will be fittingly elevated in the pages of U.S. history.

I ask my colleagues to join me in passing this important legislation.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, today before the U.S. House of Representatives is a landmark piece of legislation that marks an important step toward restoring balance in the history of the Battle of the Little Bighorn in 1876.

For years, we have paid homage to Col. George A. Custer and the estimated 268 of his U.S. Cavalry forces who were killed in this famous battle. The names of these brave soldiers, scouts and civilians attached to the 7th Cavalry are remembered in a monument erected in 1881 over the mass gravesite on Last Stand Hill.

But nothing stands to remember the estimated 3,000 Indian warriors who fell in this battle in defense of their families, their traditional lifestyle and their livelihoods. Nothing stands to recognize their courageous spirit, their fierce determination to desperately hold onto the way of life as they knew it before the coming of the white man.

H.R. 4660 seeks to change that. It seeks, as it were, to "set the record straight," to tell the "rest of the story." This legislation simply authorizes the construction of a memorial at Custer Battlefield National Monument located in my Congressional District in eastern Montana. H.R. 4660 takes a simple step toward restoring historical balance, but it is no less significant.

For the Indians, I believe the establishment of a memorial means their story will begin to be heard with greater balance and with greater understanding. We will begin to hear more about these fallen warriors, about the 8,000 to 10,000 women, children and advisors who encamped near the battle site on June 25 and June 26, 1876. We will hear more about what led to their decision to stand up and fight rather than simply surrender.

Though some may view the establishment of an Indian memorial as an action that will reopen old wounds, I view it in a completely opposite light. The purpose of H.R. 4660 is not to divide, but, rather, to unite and I believe unity can only exist as we understand each other, as we seek to learn the reasons why others acted as they did. Clearly, it is only through a peaceful relationship between people of all races that our Nation can achieve the unity that is vital to continued strength and prosperity.

Passage of H.R. 4660 could come at no better time. The year 1990 marks the 100th anniversary of the last battle fought by the Indians—on December 23, 1890 at Wounded

Knee, SD. One hundred years ago, these proud and noble people laid down their arms. We can do nothing better in honoring these people for their decision to achieve peace by passing this bill this year.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak today in support of this legislation and I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4660, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING THE LAKE MEREDITH NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4878) to establish the Lake Meredith National Recreation Area in the State of Texas, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4878

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—In order to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the lands and waters associated with Lake Meredith in the State of Texas, and to protect the scenic, scientific, cultural, and other values contributing to the public enjoyment of such lands and waters, there is hereby established the Lake Meredith National Recreation Area (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "recreation area").

(b) AREA INCLUDED.—The recreation area shall consist of the lands, waters, and interests therein within the area generally depicted on the map entitled "Lake Meredith National Recreation Area Boundary Map, 'Fee-Take Line'", numbered SWRO-80,023-A, and dated September 1990. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") may from time to time make minor revisions in the boundary of the recreation area.

(c) TRANSFER.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal lands, waters, and interests therein within the recreation area are hereby transferred to the National Park Service.

(2) Those lands depicted on the map referred to in subsection (b) that are necessary for the continued operation, maintenance, and replacement of the Canadian River Project facilities and its purposes of providing for municipal and industrial water supply and flood control shall remain under

the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation.

SEC. 2. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the recreation area in accordance with this Act and the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the national park system, including the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), and the Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 885). In the administration of such recreation area, the Secretary may utilize such statutory authority as may be available to him for the protection of natural and cultural resources as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) OPERATION OF CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect or interfere with the authority of the Secretary under the Act of December 29, 1950 (Public Law 81-898; 43 U.S.C. 600b et seq.), to operate Sanford Dam and Lake Meredith in accordance with and for the purposes set forth in that Act.

(c) LAND ACQUISITION.—Within the boundary of the recreation area, the Secretary may acquire lands and interests in lands by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer without reimbursement from any Federal agency.

(d) CULTURAL RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall conduct a survey of the cultural resources in the immediate vicinity of the recreation area. The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with public or private entities, including landowners, for the purpose of conducting the survey required by this subsection. Not later than three years after the date on which funds have been made available, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate on the results of the survey required by this subsection.

(e) HUNTING AND FISHING.—(1) The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under the Secretary's jurisdiction within the recreation area in accordance with applicable Federal and State law. The Secretary may designate zones where, and establish time periods when, hunting or fishing will not be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish and wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment.

(2) Except in emergencies any regulations issued by the Secretary under this subsection shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agencies responsible for hunting and fishing activities.

(f) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—For purposes of administering the recreation area, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with any Federal agency, the State of Texas, or any political subdivision thereof, including the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority, for the rendering, on a reimbursable basis, of rescue, firefighting, law enforcement, fire preventive assistance, and other needs. The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the city of Fritch, Texas, to develop and operate a joint venture information center. Federal funds may be expended on non-Federal lands and improvements through cooperative agreements for the purpose of this section on a 50-50 matching basis.

SEC. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

□ 1350

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 4878, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4878 designates the Lake Meredith National Recreation Area in the State of Texas and transfers administration of most of the existing Sanford Dam-Lake Meredith Project Area to the National Park Service for administration.

Lake Meredith was constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation in the mid-1960's as the key part of the Canadian River project, primarily for the purpose of providing municipal water supply for the panhandle region of Texas. The recreation features at Lake Meredith have been administered by the National Park Service under a memorandum of understanding with the Bureau of Reclamation since project completion, almost 25 years. During that 25-year period Lake Meredith has become the second most popular facility managed by the National Park Service's Southwest Region, accommodating approximately 1½ million visitors annually.

The designation of Lake Meredith as a full-fledged unit of the National Park System will consolidate responsibility for all aspects of resource management for the area with the National Park Service and will provide much needed official recognition of the long-standing administrative arrangements for the area. Designation will also help focus management attention on the cultural resources found within the area.

During its deliberations of the bill the committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The substitute more clearly defines the area to be transferred to the Park Service and that which is to be retained by the Bureau of Reclamation for project operation. The substitute also clarifies that it is not the intent of Congress to alter the original authorization of the Sanford Dam project contained in Public Law 81-898.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and acknowledge the efforts of Congressman SARPALIUS who sponsored this measure and who has been a great help to us in moving this bill. His actions have been instrumental in bringing us to this point.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that designation of Lake Meredith as a national recreation area is an important step in the management of the area and is one I am happy to support. I look forward to enactment of this legislation.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4878, a bill to establish Lake Meredith National Recreation Area in the State of Texas. This legislation would simply reaffirm in legislation the management scenario which has played out at Lake Meredith National Recreation Area over the last 25 years.

I understand that the administration opposes this legislation because it has not been established by the National Park Service as a priority and because of potential increased costs. However, this position seems to be at odds with actions taken by the National Park Service over the last 25 years. In 1965, the National Park Service entered voluntarily into an agreement to manage recreational use at the site. They have continued to maintain that operation. In fact over the last 10 years, the operational base at this park has been increased approximately \$350,000. At the same time, the operational base has decreased at 5 out of 31 parks in the Service's Southwest Region. In regard to impacts of increased costs, the administration has not furnished the committee with cost information, therefore it is not possible to estimate the level of impact from this proposal.

The administration also pointed out in their testimony that this area may not meet the criteria outlined in NPS policy for establishment of a national recreation area. However, a review of these criteria reveals that they are so broadly written, that an extremely wide assortment of areas would meet the criteria, including the proposal as outlined in this bill.

Clarification of the status of this area should allow it to compete more effectively for development and other funding programs of the agency. While I could not support a proliferation of these types of sites in the na-

tional park system, where NPS manages man-made impoundments, this proposal is a reasonable addition.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SARPALIUS].

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, Lake Meredith is now celebrating its 25th anniversary. It is a real jewel to the Texas Panhandle. It provides our water supplies for 13 cities, including Amarillo and Lubbock, and as was said in the testimony earlier, it is a recreational facility that many people throughout the Texas Panhandle enjoy a great deal.

In the heart of the Lake Meredith Park that we have, there is a park that is known as the Alibates. It is the only national monument that we have in the State of Texas. It is where the Indians mined flint for 12,000 years, and tribes throughout the country would gather at the site where Lake Meredith is and exchange their goods and conduct trading there. The flint there is of tremendous value to the Indian culture.

I think this piece of legislation here, H.R. 4878, creates the Lake Meredith National Recreation Area, a recreational area which would encompass as much as 46,000 acres. It gives broad funding authority to help the lake reach national status, which it deserves.

I ask my colleagues and would encourage my colleagues to support this legislation. We feel like, for the past 25 years, the park has been neglected. This gives an opportunity for Members to put more emphasis on the park, and what it means to our area. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, H.R. 4878.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4878, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN USES OF LANDS OF RICHMOND NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD PARK AND COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 4107) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to permit certain uses of lands within Richmond National Battlefield Park and Colonial National Historical Park in the Commonwealth of Virginia, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4107

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR NATURAL GAS PIPELINE.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, under regulations generally applicable to utility rights-of-way in the National Park System, to issue a permit to the Virginia Natural Gas Company granting an underground easement for the construction, operation, and maintenance of one natural gas transmission pipeline under and across the Colonial National Historical Park in the State of Virginia. The natural gas pipeline shall be located within the Virginia Power Company's existing electric transmission corridor located between Routes 143 and 716.

SEC. 2. RIGHTS-OF-WAY FOR EXISTING PIPELINES.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, under regulations generally applicable to utility rights-of-way in the National Park System, to issue permits granting underground easements for the operating and maintenance of the following existing pipeline facilities under and across the Colonial National Historical Park in the State of Virginia:

(1) Colonial Products petroleum pipeline #LOA-99-001.

(2) Virginia Natural Gas pipeline at the Glass House #LOA-90-002B.

(3) Virginia Natural Gas pipeline at Page Street #LOA-90-002C.

(4) Virginia Natural Gas pipeline at Route 143 #LOA-90-002D.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 4107, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, construction of facilities such as natural gas pipelines in units of the National Park System is

an extremely sensitive issue. It is the Interior Committee's longstanding policy that no pipeline construction will be allowed in national park units unless there is a determination that park resources will not be adversely affected and there are no prudent alternative locations for construction.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4107 as introduced by Mr. BLILEY of Virginia, directed the Secretary of the Interior to authorize construction of three natural gas pipelines. Two of the pipelines would be located in Colonial National Historic Park and one would be located in Richmond National Battlefield Park. Congressional authorization of pipeline construction is required since the National Park Service has no general authority to grant rights-of-way for natural gas or petroleum pipelines.

Action is necessary on only one of the new pipelines at this time. This pipeline is the Virginia natural gas transmission line proposed to cross Colonial National Historic Park. The key reason for the committee's recommendation to proceed is because the park stretches from Jamestown to Yorktown completely across the intervening peninsula and makes it difficult to locate utilities in the area without crossing the park. In the case of this pipeline, there is no feasible alternative to its proposed location.

In addition to the new line, there are four existing pipelines at Colonial that were improperly authorized by the National Park Service. Testimony offered by the National Park Service indicated that both the one new and four existing lines at Colonial are not incompatible with the park and its resources.

In its review of the legislation, the committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4107 which: authorizes one new pipeline at Colonial National Historic Park and deletes both the second new pipeline proposed for Colonial and the one new line proposed for Richmond National Battlefield; authorizes the four existing lines at Colonial; and authorizes, but does not mandate, the National Park Service to issue the pipeline permits.

It is the committee's understanding that the pipeline companies will be charged fair market rental for all the lines, and that any disturbance caused by placement or maintenance of the lines will be reclaimed to the National Park Service's satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, I support enactment of this legislation as amended and recommend its passage.

□ 1400

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 4107, a bill to authorize construction of a pipeline in Colonial National Historical Park. This measure was introduced by my col-

league, Mr. BLILEY, and reflects his extensive efforts to ensure this project is undertaken with a minimum of impact to this important National Park Service area. Due to his work on the bill, it is supported by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, Colonial National Parkway extends as a narrow ribbon of green between the York and James Rivers, just east of Williamsburg, VA. The parkway already has a moderate level of urban development on both sides; thus there are no alternatives to crossing this road for expansion of service. The proposal brought forward by Mr. BLILEY minimizes the extent of potential impact on the park by using an already developed utility corridor and using construction methods which minimize impacts to park resources.

This bill also addresses a concern which exists at a currently unknown number of National Park Service areas, by providing the authority for four existing pipelines at the park to continue. The National Park Service has no generic authority to permit petroleum product pipelines across its lands, and preliminary estimates indicate there may be as many as several hundred existing, unauthorized petroleum pipelines in various National Park Service units around the country. The National Park Service needs authority to permit these existing lines to remain where appropriate and possibly to permit new lines under certain conditions. I hope we will be able to address this situation in the future.

I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. VENTO, for working with us on this measure and helping to facilitate passage of this bill which will be very important to hundreds of future customers to be served by this line.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 1989, I was contacted by the city of Richmond requesting my help in getting authorization for the construction of a 137-mile natural gas transmission pipeline that would provide gas for residential, commercial, and industrial use. One of its major customers will be the city of Richmond.

In order to complete this pipeline, which has been approved by the State corporation commission, the builders of the pipeline must acquire underground easement rights through national historic parkland for a short segment of the pipeline. Unfortunately, the National Park Service has the authority only to grant overhead easements. For this reason, on February 23, 1990, I introduced H.R. 4107 which will give the appropriate easement

rights for the completion of the pipeline.

Since that time, as a result of discussions held between the pipeline builders, the National Park Service, and the subcommittee chaired by the honorable gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. VENTO], the bill has been further refined and strengthened. The bill will now provide for the construction of the pipeline through the Colonial National Historical Park as well as grandfather four existing pipelines in that park.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman VENTO and his staff for their prompt and professional consideration of this legislation. I also want to thank the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, Mr. MARLENEE, and his staff for their response to this legislation. The completion of this pipeline will have a very positive impact, not only on my constituents but the entire Commonwealth of Virginia. It will help provide a safe, reliable, domestic, and clean burning fuel choice to the people of Virginia.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4107, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit certain uses of lands within the Colonial National Historical Park, in the Commonwealth of Virginia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY HERITAGE CORRIDOR

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 830) to amend Public Law 99-647, establishing the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission, to authorize the Commission to take immediate action in furtherance of its purposes, and to increase the authorization of appropriations for the Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 830

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN.

Section 8 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor in Massachusetts

and Rhode Island", approved November 10, 1986 (Public Law 99-647, 16 U.S.C. 461 note) (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), is amended by inserting the following at the end thereof:

"(c)(1) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to undertake a limited experimental program of financial assistance for the purpose of providing demonstration funds for projects within the corridor which exhibit national significance or provide a wide spectrum of historic, recreational, or environmental education opportunities to the general public in a manner consistent with the purposes of this Act.

"(2) Applications for funds under this section shall be made to the Secretary through the Commission. Each application shall include the recommendation of the Commission and its findings as to how the project proposed to be funded will further the purposes of this Act.

"(3) The Secretary is authorized to provide funds for the following purposes—

"(A) preservation and restoration of properties on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places;

"(B) design and development of interpretive exhibits to encourage public understanding of the resources of the Blackstone Valley; and

"(C) cultural programs and environmental education programs related to environmental awareness or historic preservation;

"(4) Funds made available pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed 50 percent of the total costs of the project to be funded. In making such funds available, the Secretary shall give consideration to projects which provide a greater leverage of Federal funds. Any payment made shall be subject to an agreement that conversion, use, or disposal of the project so assisted for purposes contrary to the purposes of this Act, as determined by the Secretary, shall result in a right of the United States of compensation of all funds made available to such project or the proportion of the increased value of the project attributable to such funds as determined at the time of such conversion, use, or disposal, whichever is greater."

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 10 of the Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 10", striking "250,000 for the next five fiscal years" and inserting "350,000 for each year in which the Commission is in existence" and inserting at the end thereof the following—

"(b) DEMONSTRATION FUNDS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of section 8(c), \$1,000,000 annually for fiscal years 1991, 1992, and 1993, to remain available until expended."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 830, which passed the Senate in July 1989, amends the act establishing the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission to make grants for certain activities related to the Corridor and to increase the authorization of appropriations to the commission. The legislation is similar to H.R. 2127, introduced by Representatives MACHLEY, EARLY, and ATKINS.

The Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor was established by Public Law 99-647 in November 1986. Its purpose is to provide a cooperative management framework for the preservation and interpretation of the significant resources of the corridor associated with the American industrial revolution. To assist in this effort a 19 member commission was established to prepare a plan and help coordinate preservation and interpretation efforts.

During committee consideration of S. 830, several significant changes were made to the bill. As amended, the bill provides for a limited, targeted program of financial assistance to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior for qualified projects within the Heritage Corridor that fulfill the purposes for which the corridor was designated. This change addresses the concerns that had been raised about changing the nature of the Blackstone Commission from a planning and advisory body to a grantmaking authority. The amended bill also provides for cost sharing of funds and contains limitations on the use of these funds to avoid duplication with such programs as the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Historic Preservation Fund.

Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable interest and enthusiasm in Massachusetts and Rhode Island for the National Heritage Corridor designation of the Blackstone River Valley. The Blackstone Commission has been active in the corridor in carrying out its responsibilities. The limited and targeted program provided for by S. 830 as amended will help focus the conservation and interpretation efforts within the corridor. I support S. 830, as amended, and recommend its adoption by the House.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 830. This bill would provide for an increase in the authorized ceiling and funding purposes for the Blackstone River National Heritage Corridor. The amount of Federal funding authorized in this bill is relatively modest. However, in combination with matching funds to be provided from other sources, these dollars will make a sig-

nificant contribution to the success of this area.

In the last several years, Congress has enacted a number of park proposals which contain cost-sharing provisions. Such designations are appropriate for areas which are determined not to contain suitability for permanent designation as a National Park Service unit.

Several months ago, our subcommittee requested specific information from the administration regarding financial contributions from other sources for the Blackstone River project. They have informed us that over the last 2 years, State contributions for this area have exceeded federal funding by a 5-to-1 ratio.

This measure is only partially supported by the administration. Their major concern with the bill relate to the fact that by providing for site-specific granting authority in this bill we are undermining such programs as the National Historic Preservation Grant Program. I share that concern, but believe that the safeguards enacted in this bill provide some measure of insurance against that possibility.

I would like to recognize my colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY], a principal cosponsor of this bipartisan bill. His cooperation in the development of this bill and his continued support of the Blackstone River project will be key to the success of this area in the future.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

□ 1410

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island. [Mr. MACHTLEY].

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to personally thank the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], as well as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and their staffs for the fine cooperative effort which they provided in assuring that there was an amended version of S. 830 which was acceptable.

I also wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EARLY], for his leadership and his guidance in making sure that the reality of this bill was in fact something that could be achieved in this term.

Mr. Speaker, this river flows 47 miles through both Massachusetts and Rhode Island. It is a unique historic location. It is fortuitous that we would have this legislation before us on the expected week of the textile bill, for it was in this location that the textile industrial revolution began, now over 200 years ago.

This year, on May 29, 1790, this stamp was commissioned which shows the Slater Mill, a classic building which was built by Samuel Slater, who memorized the works of England and brought them into this region.

This area has 47 historic districts, 5,000 historic buildings. This legislation will help preserve the historic character and the historic place of the textile industrial revolution in our history.

I also wish to thank the Members from the other body, the Senators PELL and CHAFEE, for their leadership in sponsoring and passing similar legislation.

We in Massachusetts and in Rhode Island are very proud of the unique history which this river has borne as the leader and founding place of the industrial revolution.

The special historic value of this area was given recognition 4 years ago with the enactment of Public Law 99-646, which created the Blackstone Valley National Heritage Corridor.

Since that time, there has been strong bipartisan and community spirit and pride to ensure that this Historic Valley National Heritage Corridor does, in fact, become a reality.

In recent hearings on S. 830 in the House Interior Committee many have commented on the committed demonstration by the citizens of the Blackstone Valley and their local and State communities. In fact, this is not only a good program for its unique historical aspect, but for its financial package as well. As has been indicated, local communities have leveraged the Federal dollars 5 to 1.

The project and the people behind it have more than proven themselves and now the Federal Government will be given the opportunity to endorse this program with needed additional funding.

The legislation we have under consideration today will provide the Blackstone Valley Commission with the needed operating capital for 1991, 1992, and 1993, as well as the demonstration project along its banks.

These additional funds will help preserve the historic integrity of the valuable historic Blackstone River.

Not only will it retain the historic character of this area, but it will also help the economic future of the area. There are 26 communities in the two States which abut this river, and it is no secret that during this tough economic period in New England this will be an enormous help.

I am pleased that this legislation has, in fact, come to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Ms. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 830, the Blackstone River Valley Heritage Commission Amendments and I congratulate my colleague, Representative RON

MACHTLEY, for his successful efforts on behalf of this bill in the House.

In 1790, Samuel Slater built the first models for the Arkwright Mill and 3 years later he built the first successful water-powered cotton mill in Pawtucket, Rhode Island. The textile industry celebrates its 200th anniversary in America this year and I can think of no finer recognition of that event than the passage of this bill to preserve and enhance the cradle of American industry.

In 1986, Congress passed legislation designating the Blackstone River Valley as a National Heritage Corridor in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. This served to provide an official affiliation between the region and the National Park Service, which provides it with technical assistance.

S. 830 builds on this earlier legislation to strengthen the Federal-State-local partnership that has been so successful to date. It also provides the authority to fund programs that have already been initiated with private money. Specifically, S. 830 authorizes funding for: Matching grants to preserve and restore historic structures in the area; acquisition of threatened parcels of land for open spaces; initial planning and design of exhibits at interpretive centers; and cultural and education program grants.

The preservation of the heritage of our country is one of the finest gifts we can pass on to our children. This legislation takes a step in the proper direction of guaranteeing that this important part of our past is understood and enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this bill recognizes the importance that innovative industrial activities played in the early days of our country, and I hope that spirit of innovation that was first felt in the Blackstone River Valley will continue to be exhibited during the centuries to come.

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending legislation to authorize the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission to take immediate action in furtherance of its purposes and to increase the authorization of appropriations for the commission.

The Blackstone River Valley has national significance as the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution, and the Rhode Island system on manufacturing. In recognition of the nationally significant resources of the Blackstone River Valley, which runs from Worcester, MA, to Pawtucket, RI, the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Act was enacted in November 1986 to facilitate the preservation and commemoration of the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution.

Three factors distinguish the valley from other industrial regions. It was the first such region in the United States; the first widespread use of water power for industry occurred on the Blackstone and branch rivers; and it was where the Rhode Island system on manufacturing was developed.

The technology and organization of manufacturing pioneered in the Blackstone Valley influenced industrial development in the rest of our young country. As home of the Rhode Island system, a district tradition in manufac-

turing, the valley in unique. The textile manufacturing centers which developed in Worcester, Hopedale, Northbridge, and Millbury, MA, and in Pawtucket and Providence, RI, constituted one of the most important machine making districts in the Nation.

The first textile mill in the United States was established on the Blackstone River by Samuel Slater in 1790 in what is now the city of Pawtucket, RI. For more than two centuries, the massive forces of the Blackstone River spun the wheels and turbines that powered the mills along its banks. So many mills exploited the river's water power in the early 19th century that all but 30 feet of the river's 430-foot drop in altitude in its 46-mile journey from Worcester to Pawtucket was harnessed in some fashion.

The Blackstone Canal, built in the 1820's was an important canal in its own right in early America, contributing to the growth and commercial prominence of Worcester and Providence, now the second and third largest cities in New England.

Since the enactment of the legislation establishing the National Heritage Corridor, Massachusetts and Rhode Island have intensified its cooperative efforts to revitalize the corridor and preserve and interpret the unique and significant contributions of the Blackstone Valley to our heritage. As required by Public Law 99-647, The Commission has prepared a cultural heritage and land management plan and, after extensive review, this plan was approved by the Secretary of the Interior. It is an excellent plan. It has received an enormous response from my constituents. The Governors of Rhode Island and Massachusetts have reviewed it and enthusiastically agreed to help implement it. There has been a new surge of investment in plan objectives from private citizens as well as local and State government.

The legislation before us today authorizes the Secretary of Interior to provide demonstration funds for projects within the corridor to assist in the implementation of this plan. It also authorizes additional funds to enable the commission to carry out its responsibilities under the act and in implementing the corridor plan.

The Blackstone Valley is unique in its ability to convey, through its rich social history and extensive physical remnants and ruins, the story of the textile industry in New England, the canal building era, and the diverse immigrant population that came to the valley in search of jobs. In addition to its historic importance, the river has beautiful natural stretches and scenic areas that provide green spaces and opportunities for recreation in the midst of the densely populated valley. The Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor was created because the historic character of the valley's 19th century mill villages, rural landscape and open spaces have been damaged by economic decline and 20th century pollution. And, it is now being threatened by the quickening pace of suburbanization.

I am more convinced than ever of the importance of preserving the historical and cultural resources of the corridor, and of the unique opportunity we have to share with present and future generations its significant contributions to our national heritage. The mills, villages, transportation networks, and

social history of the early settlers in this area tell the story of the industrialization of 18th and 19th century America. The valley offers an invaluable resource for the study and application of the community life and workplace in industrial America.

With the assistance authorized in this legislation, the Blackstone River Valley corridor takes another step closer to realizing its potential. Not only will it benefit residents of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, but it will also help to preserve, and bring to life, a very important part of our heritage for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues support of this legislation.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the leadership of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTELEY], in assisting us in getting this legislation to the floor. I urge our colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 830, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT FOR BRAZILIAN CONSERVATION EFFORTS TO PROTECT THE AMAZON

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 431) to establish that it is the policy of the United States to encourage and support conservation efforts initiated by Brazil to protect the Amazon forest, and that the United States should redouble its efforts to reduce its pollution of the global environment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 431

Whereas the Federal Republic of Brazil is a longstanding friend of the United States, being our most populous neighbor in the Western Hemisphere, and a trading partner with whom we have conducted over \$10,000,000,000 of trade per year;

Whereas Brazil possesses within its borders over six hundred million acres of one of the greatest natural resources on Earth, the vast forest of the Amazon, comprising 30 percent of the world's tropical forests, 18 percent of the world's fresh river water, and the habitat of approximately 30 percent of all life species, including more species of primates, flowering plants, and psittacine birds than are found in any other nation;

Whereas this great resource is indisputably under the sovereign authority of Brazil, and any suggestion to subject the Amazon to international control or in any way di-

minish Brazil's sovereign authority over it should be condemned as inappropriate;

Whereas the conservation and preservation of its Amazon forest is ultimately the responsibility of Brazil and it is developing a body of environmental law and has included in its new constitution a strong commitment to environment protection;

Whereas the increasingly large and accurate body of scientific knowledge regarding the greenhouse effect has demonstrated that the environmental degradation of Amazonia makes a significant contribution to the greenhouse effect;

Whereas the environmental degradation of Amazonia results in a loss of genetic resources found in its rich biological diversity, degradation of soil quality, erosion, and accelerated siltation of waterways;

Whereas such environmental degradation jeopardizes the renewable nature of Amazonia natural resources;

Whereas the United States supports the sustainable economic development of all tropical nations, including Brazil, for humanitarian, political, economic, and environmental reasons, and, to a great extent, the development of these nations depends on increasing production from their potentially renewable soil, forest, and water resources in an environmental sound manner; and

Whereas the United States has historically faced, and continues to face, many environmental problems of its own, resulting in a wealth of technology and experience useful to sustainable development and environmental protection: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) it is the policy of the United States to unequivocally recognize Brazil's sovereign authority in the Amazon, rejecting any suggestion of international control or foreign domination over the area;

(2) where appropriate, the United States should adopt a policy to encourage and support conservation efforts initiated by Brazil to protect the Amazon forest and should be open and willing to respond positively, through means such as technical assistance, international financing coupled with environmental assessments, and various mechanisms to reduce unsound development of the Amazon forest which is a result of economic and social factors; and

(3) the United States should redouble its efforts to address development within its own borders in an environmentally sound and sustainable manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON].

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I must consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support House Joint Resolution 431, and want to acknowledge the gentleman from Virginia [Mr.

WOLF] for this outstanding and extremely relevant measure. Let me also commend the subcommittee's ranking minority member, Mr. BEREUTER, whose leadership and cooperation on environmental issues has been extremely valuable. I would also like to commend the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman FASCELL, and the ranking Republican member of the Committee, Congressman BROOMFIELD, for their efforts in getting this legislation to the floor in an expeditious manner.

Mr. Speaker, Brazil's Amazon Rain Forest comprises a vast area and contains an abundance of plant and animal life. It is a natural resource of unparalleled value. The Amazon is also a major factor in global climate change.

The new President of Brazil has made environmental conservation one of his administration's highest priorities, appointing an internationally known environmentalist to oversee the environmental ministry.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 431 calls on the United States to support and cooperate with Brazil in its efforts to protect the Amazon. By explicitly recognizing Brazilian sovereignty over the area, and calling attention to our own pollution problems, the resolution is a constructive step to respond positively to Brazil's needs, and to enhance United States-Brazilian relations.

The Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously passed the resolution after adopting some technical amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to strongly support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution to encourage and support greater efforts to preserve the Amazon rain forests.

It has become increasingly clear in recent years that the living resources of the Amazon basin have unique value. It is also clear, unfortunately, that they are under extraordinary threat from human activities.

I commend the sponsor, Mr. WOLF, for crafting this resolution. Aside from its statements of concern, what is striking about this resolution is its sensitivity to the concerns of Brazil concerning its sovereignty over this area, and the recognition that Brazil is not alone in having major environmental problems.

I also wish to commend Chairman FASCELL for calling up this resolution and the primary subcommittee of jurisdiction, the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations under the able leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania,

[Mr. YATRON] and the gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. BEREUTER], for giving it their full consideration.

As this resolution states, the United States should develop further policies to assist Brazil to protect its precious natural heritage in the Amazon. I am sure that the Committee on Foreign Affairs as well as other committees will be considering legislation in the future that will address various aspects of this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. BEREUTER].

□ 1420

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin this legislation, this series of four bills or resolutions, by commending the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] for his effort and his initiative in bringing this legislation to the floor, as well as the ranking Republican on the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. In all four instances, this legislation is advancing because of their effort.

On House Joint Resolution 431 I would say, first of all, that everyone in this body is aware of the critical importance of the Amazon rain forest, yet it is our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] who has taken the initiative to advance this legislation, and he deserves to be commended for that effort. It is one of the world's greatest natural resources containing 30 percent of the world's tropical forests and 18 percent of the world's fresh water reserves. The continued loss of this natural asset would result in the acceleration of the greenhouse effect, as well as threatening the survival of large numbers of plant and animal species that are endemic or native to the tropical forest.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution recognizes the effort made by the Government of Brazil to preserve their tropical forests and urges the United States to support those efforts whenever possible. It recognizes Brazil's sovereign authority over the Amazon and makes it clear that this is not an attempt to exert foreign control over matters that rightly belong to the Brazilian people. Nevertheless, it expresses our concern. I would note, of course, that this resolution, in the careful way it is drafted, is a very important point in Brazilian-American relations.

In short, it is a useful, balanced resolution, and, again, this Member would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for bringing this issue to our attention.

As an additional note, Mr. Speaker, that while we in the United States have appropriately devoted a great deal of attention to the Brazilian rain forest, we have paid much less attention to our own very limited rain forests in Hawaii and Puerto Rico. A full 75 percent of the Hawaiian tropical forests have been destroyed and 96 percent of the Puerto Rican rain forests have been lost. While it is appropriate to encourage Brazil in every way possible, those in this body who serve on committees with environmental jurisdiction should not ignore the very scarce and precious assets remaining in the United States.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 431. The Amazon River basin and forest is one of the Earth's greatest natural resources. Its 600 million acres include 30 percent of the entire planet's tropical forest, and 18 percent of its fresh river water. The Amazon is also the habitat of almost one-third of all the species of life on Earth, including more types of primates and flowering plants than are in any other nation.

The lush plant life of the Amazon forest is responsible for removing millions of tons of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and replacing it with oxygen. Some have called the Amazon the lungs of the planet. The further degradation of the Amazon would increase the concentration of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere and exacerbate the greenhouse effect. Protecting the Amazon from degradation in the interest of everyone.

Yet this resolution also rightfully recognizes Brazil's sovereign authority over the Amazon. The worst thing that could be done in the interest in protecting the Amazon's environmental integrity is to try to impose some sort of international or external authority over the forest and river basin. The Government and people of Brazil would never stand for that, any more than the American people would accept international jurisdiction over the Mississippi. Environmental concern over this vital global resource cannot be seen as imperialism.

The Government of Brazil recognizes the importance of the Amazon. The United States should encourage and support Brazilian conservation efforts to protect the Amazon forest with technical assistance, and international financing incentives. We should especially work to eliminate incentives for unsound and environmentally dangerous practices that may be maintained by international development banks to which the United States be-

longs. This must be a Brazilian task, but America must be willing to help.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Virginia for introducing this vital resolution, and the Foreign Affairs Committee, especially the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], and Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for bringing it to the floor of the House. I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 431.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the sponsor of this measure, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Human Rights, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] for bringing this measure to the floor at this time. I am a cosponsor along with the subcommittee's ranking minority member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. Speaker, this is an important issue. The issue of rain forests and the issue of global warming are all interrelated. It is important that we recognize the sovereignty of Brazil as we consider what steps should be taken, but I would hope that the Government of Brazil would recognize the extreme importance of this measure in trying to deter the effect of eliminating our rain forests on global warming.

House Joint Resolution 431 recognizes the uniqueness of the Amazon forests' ecosystem, biological diversity and impact on the world's environment. However, perhaps even more importantly, the resolution also recognizes Brazil's sovereign authority in the Amazon and states that the United States should increase its efforts to address environmental problems within our own borders.

As William Nitze, U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, said:

It is clear that global climate change is inherently an international issue that transcends national boundaries and can be addressed effectively only through international cooperation. Action by the United States or any country alone will not be effective.

Despite the worldwide concern for the devastating consequences of environmental degradation and the opinion of the international scientific community that a warming of the Earth's atmosphere represents a threat of the severest magnitude, the global community has only recently begun to seriously address the threat posed by the destruction of our world's forests.

In order to fully accomplish our goals, we must positively state our intent, both unilaterally and collectively, toward developing solutions to the environmental problems facing our world today.

This resolution states both our support for Brazil's initiatives with respect to the Amazon as well as reiterating the intent of the United States to continue with initiatives to protect the environment. Accordingly, I invite and urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the House Foreign Affairs Committee for its consideration of this important foreign policy resolution. In particular, I would like to thank Chairman DANTE FASCELL and Vice Chairman BILL BROOMFIELD for their support and cosponsorship of House Joint Resolution 431.

I also would like to acknowledge Chairman GUS YATRON and Vice Chairman DOUG BEREUTER of the Human Rights Subcommittee for their support and for taking the lead on committee action for this resolution.

House Joint Resolution 431 is a foreign policy resolution which places the Congress firmly on record in support of conservation efforts in the Brazilian Amazon, a 2.7-million square mile river and forest area representing nearly one-third of all the world's tropical forest.

This resolution is an important first step in what should be a concerted effort by the United States Government to seek ways in which to help Brazil, and other countries with significant land areas of tropical rain forest, slow the current, very alarming rate of deforestation.

The destruction of the world's rain forest is occurring at a rate of 54 acres a minute. Every year, we lose a tropical rain forest area the size of Pennsylvania, Ohio, or Virginia. If left unchecked, the current rate of deforestation will result in the complete destruction of all the world's rain forests in the next century.

Many in Congress have long been deeply concerned about the disturbing loss of rain forest that continues to occur. Many of my colleagues already know about the importance of the Amazon region, and that the Amazon rain forest is teeming with life like no other region of the world.

Home to more types of fish than in all European rivers, more bird species than in all the forests of North America, and plant life which has produced startling advances in medical science, the Amazon rain forest has a unique and critical role in the Earth's environmental stability.

The riches of the world's rain forests have many uses. From the cup of coffee you have for breakfast, to anesthesia for medical surgery, rain forests provide many products which enhance our daily lives. The World Resources Institute estimates that about 1,400

plants in tropical forests are believed to offer cures for cancers. A drug from the rain forests' periwinkle plant is now used to treat Hodgkin's disease and childhood leukemia, and the drug we use to treat high blood pressure comes also from the Amazon.

No less an important reason to curb tropical deforestation and protect the world's rain forests, is the catastrophic impact the continued burning of rain forests may have on the Earth's weather patterns, carbon dioxide emission levels, and our oxygen supply.

We in the United States contribute much to the carbon dioxide levels through car emissions, and should look for ways by which we can reduce our own pollution of the Earth. House Joint Resolution 431 recognizes this and states that the United States should redouble our own efforts to reduce our pollution of the global environment.

Foremost, House Joint Resolution 431 is a clear statement of U.S. policy toward the Brazilian Amazon. This policy was first put forth by Senator JOHN CHAFFEE of Rhode Island, who led a well-received congressional visit to Brazil and the Amazon rain forest early last year. Upon his return to the United States, Senator CHAFFEE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 101, legislation which addresses the tropical deforestation problem while recognizing Brazil's autonomy over the Amazon rain forest.

I introduced House Joint Resolution 431 last November as the companion resolution to Senator CHAFFEE's bill. Since then, the resolution has picked up the cosponsorship of 123 of my colleagues in the House, the support of the U.S. State Department, and has attracted the endorsement of two leading environmental groups, the World Wildlife Fund and Conservation International.

The new Government and President in Brazil seem to be more sensitive to Brazil's tropical deforestation problems, which are so closely intertwined with their economy. The United States should now look for ways to encourage support for the new government to continue positive conservation initiatives in the Amazon.

It is vitally important that we act soon. The words of Thomas Lovejoy, the Smithsonian Institution's foremost expert on the Amazon rain forest, are ominous: He warns that,

If the rain forest destruction is allowed to run its course, the Earth will suffer the most devastating blow to life in all our history.

I urge all my colleagues to lend your support to House Joint Resolution 431 and help Brazil meet the truly global challenge of tropical deforestation.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this joint resolution, and again I want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], chairman of the full committee, the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], and, of course, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the staff for their quick movement on this legislation. Otherwise this bill could have languished until well into the next Congress.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 431 encouraging support for Brazilian conservation efforts to protect the Amazon forest.

I want to commend Congressman WOLF for his initiative on this important environmental issue. There is great concern over the loss of the valuable tropical rain forests of the Amazon and for the impact of their destruction on Brazil's ecological balance and for the world's changing climate.

The President of Brazil Fernando Collor is to be commended for his strong efforts to promote conservation of the Amazon forest resources. All of us who wish to see him succeed in his goal to preserve Brazil's fragile ecosystem applaud and support his efforts. They have significance not only for Brazil but for the rest of the world as well.

I urge prompt passage of this resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 431, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING LINKAGE BETWEEN THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 248) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the linkage between environment and national security, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 248

Whereas accelerating loss of forests, the spreading of deserts, the degradation of rivers and streams, the ruination of farmland, the increase of pollution, spiralling population growth and a host of other environmental stresses on the natural resource base are important factors which affect national security and global stability;

Whereas some experts estimate that 35 percent of the world's farmland is headed toward an unproductive condition as a result of erosion, salinization, deforestation, pollution, waterlogging, and desertification;

Whereas 1988 world grain consumption exceeded production by 152 million tons, chronic food shortages are plaguing many countries, and entire continents have experienced declines in per capita food production;

Whereas scientific forecasts of global warming from fossil fuel combustion and deforestation warn that major food shortages may result from such climate change and may place severe hardships on many countries;

Whereas the Congress is concerned that the combination of these factors will undermine initiatives to establish healthy, sustainable economies, will contribute to increasing political instability, and will constitute a major threat to national security and global peace;

Whereas unbridled consumption—and the resulting waste—in developed nations is a chief source of environmental degradation, and Third World countries continue to damage the environment through industrial pollutants, radical deforestation, or unlimited exploitation of nonrenewable resources;

Whereas destruction of the national resource base leads to displacement of local populations formerly dependent on these resources and increases the number of environmental refugees, which can be a significant source of conflict and tension as these people desperately seek new land in other parts of their own country or in other countries;

Whereas reckless exploitation of natural resources can rapidly drain a nation's wealth and create conditions of instability; and

Whereas the geopolitical landscape can change quickly and dramatically due to the political instability resulting from hunger and deprivation brought on by environmental problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development—

(1) should give increasing attention to the linkage between environment and national security; and

(2) should focus a significant portion of United States foreign assistance on environmental restoration, reforestation, pollution control, family planning improvements in the efficiency of energy use, and rehabilitation of degraded ecosystems in order to—

(A) provide the basis for healthy, sustainable economies, and

(B) reduce serious tensions and political unrest stemming from deteriorating environmental conditions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON].

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 248 and want to commend my good friend from New York Mr. GILMAN, for this critical initiative. He has been one of the foremost leaders of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the House of Representatives on global environmental problems. Let me also commend Mr. BEREUTER, ranking member of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations for all his hard work on international environmental issues. I would also like to commend the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman FASCELL, and the ranking Republican member of the committee, Congressman BROOMFIELD, for the expeditious manner in which they moved this legislation to the floor.

The resolution calls on the State Department and AID to give increasing attention to the link between environment and national security and to ensure a significant portion of U.S. foreign assistance be focused on environmental problems.

The pollution of our land, waters and atmosphere, the destruction of wildlife, the expansion of deserts, and the cutting of forests have undermined sustainable economic growth, and created conditions contributing to political instability around the world. National security and global peace are seriously threatened by the continuation of environmental problems.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 248 is an important step in addressing this issue. The Foreign Affairs Committee passed House Concurrent Resolution 248, as amended without dissent.

I ask my colleagues for their support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, which is intended to highlight the linkage between the international environment and national security.

It is clear that environmental problems can cause severe social and economic dislocations. If left unchecked, these problems can actually pose threats to international peace and security.

I commend the principal sponsor, Mr. GILMAN, for putting forward this useful resolution. I also wish to thank Chairman FASCELL for considering it in committee and Congressmen YATRON and BEREUTER for working on it in subcommittee.

To me, what is important about this resolution is that it recognizes that the causes of international environmental problems are not confined to the poorer countries. Industrial and other activities everywhere create environmental problems, but the developing countries may feel them most acutely.

We must respond to the sources of environmental destruction before the point is reached where they actually threaten security and peace. Not only this, but it is also our moral duty to respond to the extent possible to pressing human needs and the destruction of the natural world. It is entirely appropriate, therefore, that the resolution calls upon the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development to increase the priority accorded to these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding at this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 248 states that the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development should give increasing attention to the linkage between environment and national security, and should focus a significant portion of U.S. foreign assistance to countries suffering from political unrest stemming from deteriorating environmental conditions.

The deepening and widening global hunger and environmental crises presents a threat to national security—and even survival—that may be greater than well-armed, ill disposed neighbors and unfriendly alliances. Already in parts of Eastern Europe, Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, hunger and environmental decline is becoming a source of political

unrest and international tension. The recent destruction of much of Africa's dry land agricultural production was more severe than if an invading army had pursued a scorched-earth policy.

Presently our Government tends to base its approach to security on traditional definitions. And arms production—in all parts of the world—preempts resources that might be used more productively to diminish the security threats created by hunger and environmental degradation and the resentments that are refueled by widespread poverty.

Mr. Sepaker, for these reasons, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 248 and I write and urge my colleagues to support the bill and I thank the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], and the subcommittee's ranking minority member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for their kind support in bringing this measure to the floor at this time.

□ 1440

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks a respected Member of the other body, the senior Senator from Georgia, has attracted considerable attention by appropriately suggesting that the Department of Defense has a natural role in the preservation of the environment, and that the environment is a matter of national security. This Member would simply note that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] reached that same conclusion some months earlier, and that House Concurrent Resolution 248 is a testament to his foresight. I'm pleased to be a cosponsor of another excellent Gilman initiative.

House Concurrent Resolution 248 is a recognition that patterns of unconstrained consumption and waste must change, and that continued destruction of natural resources can threaten the survival of nations. There is no way that any nation can maintain healthy, sustained development if their nonrenewable resources are plundered. When nations opt for the quick economic fix through indiscriminate mining or harvesting of forests, future generations must pay. Long-term political stability and sustainable growth can best be secured through careful management and utilization of a nation's natural resources.

The resolution before this body today urges the Agency for International Development to pay close atten-

tion to environmental matters, and to assist in matters such as reforestation, pollution control, and rehabilitation of degraded ecosystems. This Member would point out that this resolution is wholly consistent with AID policy. The new AID Director has reaffirmed the Agency's commitment to work with developing nations to preserve their natural resources. It is AID's policy to assist in ways that are environmentally sound, and to ensure that development programs do not undermine the natural resource base.

Mr. Speaker, the Member would only add that the State Department fully supports House Concurrent Resolution 248, and that it was approved unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This Member would urge approval of this resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 248, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REGARDING CONVENTION ON RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 312) urging the President to submit the Convention on the Rights of the Child to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 312

Whereas the future peace and prosperity of all nations depend upon the good health and well-being of the world's children;

Whereas the Congress has long recognized the vulnerability of children and has enacted numerous laws that afford them special protections in this country;

Whereas similar protections for children are either totally lacking or inadequately enforced in much of the world;

Whereas, in part as a result of this lack of protection, millions of children are threatened daily by poverty, malnutrition, homelessness, exploitation, and abuse, depriving both family and society of their productivity and potential;

Whereas the child survival and development revolution launched in 1982 to attack the root causes of infant mortality and child ill-health through low-cost means such as universal child immunization and oral rehydration therapy, is saving the lives of more than 3,000,000 children each year and has demonstrated that the number of child deaths can be reduced significantly if available resources are used appropriately;

Whereas despite these gains and an emerging international consensus about the importance of protecting children, children both in the United States and abroad will continue to face poverty, sickness, and ill-treatment;

Whereas on November 20, 1989, the United States and other members of the United Nations unanimously endorsed the Convention on the Rights of the Child and urged national governments to ratify the convention and make possible its application as international law;

Whereas the Convention, if implemented, will help establish universal legal standards for the care and protection of children against neglect, exploitation, and abuse;

Whereas the United States Government, scores of private voluntary organizations, and hundreds of American citizens were actively involved in the drafting of the Convention; and

Whereas the United States must continue playing a leading role in the implementation of the Convention to ensure that it becomes a force for improving the lot of children, both in this country and abroad: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the issue of children's rights and their well-being is important both to the United States and the world at large; and

(2) the President should, therefore, promptly seek the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly with the support of the United States on November 20, 1989.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON].

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in January, Congressmen BEREUTER, OWENS, SMITH of New Jersey and I introduced House Resolution 312 which urges the President to submit the Convention on the Rights of the Child to the Senate for its advice and consent. I want to commend Congressman BEREUTER for his outstanding leadership on this important initiative. I also want to commend

the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman FASCELL, and the ranking Republican Member on the Committee, Congressman BROOMFIELD, for the important role they played in facilitating the passage of this legislation.

After a 10-year long drafting process, the U.N. General Assembly, last November, unanimously adopted a comprehensive convention designed to promote the Human Rights and Welfare of the World's Children. This Convention requires governments to take legal steps to safeguard the rights of children, guarantee their access to primary education, and protect children from child labor. The Convention stresses the importance of pre and post-natal care and promotes the welfare of children in other areas such as adoptions and the treatment of orphans.

At this point, the Convention is in the interagency process and the President has not formally taken a position on submitting it to the Senate for ratification. This resolution encourages the administration to fully endorse the Convention. The resolution sends a powerful message to the international community that the American people support a comprehensive set of world standards to protect the rights of children.

At the end of September, the United Nations is convening a World Summit on Children. At this point at least 15 heads of state have indicated their desire to participate in this summit including President Bush. The passage of this resolution prior to the summit would be consistent with the leadership role the United States has traditionally taken regarding child survival.

Mr. Speaker, UNICEF is a major supporter of the Convention and the upcoming summit. That organization, which this committee has strongly supported for years, has played a crucial role in reducing the mortality rate of children worldwide. In 1982, 45,000 children died every day of preventable diseases. That figure is now 38,000 a day. While the international community's efforts have been successful, the current mortality rate suggests that we must do much more. This resolution will heighten international awareness of the plight of the world's children and I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, children have not been exempted from the current turmoil in the Persian Gulf and Saddam Hussein's ruthless aggression in Kuwait.

Last week I met with the President for the Citizens for a Free Kuwait, Hassan A. Al-Elberaheem, who provided me with information about the Iraqi Army's abuses against Kuwaiti children.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert a statement from the Citizens for a Free Kuwait which doc-

uments violations of human rights against these children.

The enactment of the Convention of the Rights of the Child would add further to the body of international law which Saddam Hussein is violating and by highlighting the abuses against these children it will serve to further isolate the Iraqi Government in the eyes of the international community.

CITIZENS FOR A FREE KUWAIT,

September 14, 1990.

HON. GUS YATRON,

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

MY DEAR MR. YATRON: I want to express my deepest gratitude for your concern for the children suffering in Kuwait as a result of the brutal aggression of Saddam Hussein. As the founder of the Arab Human Rights Organization and Chairman of the Board of the Kuwait Society for the Advancement of Arab Children, I have special interest in the treatment of these children.

Nothing points to the ruthlessness of Saddam Hussein more poignantly than his unmerciful misuse of the very young. His manipulation of political opponents through the abuse of their children is, sadly, a well documented fact.

The heartless acts of cruelty against children are simply beyond explanation or comprehension. We recently have learned that the Iraqi leader has ordered that maternity hospital incubators, used for treating premature babies, be turned off allowing these infants to die of exposure. We also have heard news accounts of Kuwaiti children suffering because of a lack of basic food necessities including infant formula. It is a virtual certainty that children in Kuwait are suffering most severely.

In addition, we have confirmed reports that children, especially girls, have been arrested and taken to Baghdad, only to show up days later in a state of severe psychological trauma refusing any attempt at communication. We can only speculate on the repulsive physical and mental abuse imposed upon these children. Reports about forced recruitment of adolescent Kuwaiti boys into the Iraqi army also are surfacing. Upon recruitment, we can be certain they are sent to Baghdad for "education."

The experiences of thousands of Kuwaiti children separated from their families, though less physically traumatic, must be devastating mentally. Tens of thousands of Kuwaiti families are now separated. The terror of these children having to face survival in a world totally foreign and unfamiliar is unimaginable.

Children of all nationalities are victims of this senseless aggression. Egyptian, Syrian, Asian, Sri Lankan, Western and other children also have been severed from family ties.

Despite the promises by Saddam Hussein that children would be allowed to return to school, no schools have opened anywhere in Kuwait.

The constant harassment of Kurdish children by Iraq is further evidence of Saddam Hussein's high disregard for a child's life. Kurdish children are routinely arrested, tortured, and executed as a method of repressing the political opposition of their parents.

The Iraqi dictator's willingness and proclivity to violate the basic rights of innocent young victims is undeniable. The world must not stand idly by as Saddam Hussein

commits such heinous crimes against children.

I urge you and the Congress to take positive steps to condemn in the strongest possible terms Saddam Hussein's ruthless acts of abuse and violations of the human rights of the key to the future of a Free Kuwait, our children.

Sincerely,

HASSAN A. AL-EBRAHEEM,
President, Citizens for a Free Kuwait.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the children of the world carry our hope for the future on their shoulders, yet they are the most vulnerable among us. Due to the lack of protection for children's rights, millions of children "are threatened daily by poverty, malnutrition, homelessness, exploitation, and abuse depriving both family and society of their productivity and potential," as the resolution before us states.

That's why the Convention on the Rights of the Children is so important. The Convention represents a notable step forward in the promotion and protection of children's rights.

Among other issues, the Convention speaks to the importance of family reunification and the need to prevent physical and mental abuse. It addresses the importance of adoption and the need to provide legal safeguards to protect children in the process. The Convention also stresses children's rights to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, and the rights of disabled children to a full and decent life.

It took 10 years of long negotiations and hard-fought compromises to develop this Convention. It is not a perfect document, but it is a firm start that should be taken for the sake of the world's children.

I wish to commend our chairman, Congressman FASCELL, as well as Congressman YATRON and BEREUTER for their important leadership in bringing House Resolution 312 to the floor for consideration. I also wish to congratulate Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey for his hard work on behalf of this resolution. Congressman SMITH served this past year on the U.S. Alternate Representative to the U.N. General Assembly and gave the principal U.S. speech in support of the Convention.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 312 urges the President to promptly seek the Senate's advice and consent to the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. I fully agree with this sentiment, and I urge our colleagues to support this resolution.

□ 1450

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 312 legislation regarding the Convention on the Rights of the Child. On November 20, 1989, the Convention on the Rights of the Child was unanimously adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The World Summit on Children will take place at the United Nations in New York at the end of this month. To date, 26 countries have ratified or acceded to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The Convention will take effect in those countries on September 2, 1990. Nations ratifying the Convention accept the document as legally binding. Regrettably, the United States is not one of them.

In considering this legislation, I ask my colleagues to consider the following selected international statistics on children:

SELECTED INTERNATIONAL STATISTICS ON CHILDREN

DEATH

40,000 children die each day from disease and preventable causes. (UNICEF), 15 million children under the age of 5 die each year. (UNICEF).

In just one day:

1,400 children die from whooping cough;
4,000 children die from the measles;
4,300 children die from tetanus;
11,000 children die from diarrhea; and
6,000 children die from pneumonia (UNICEF).

STREET CHILDREN

An estimated 100 million children live and work on the streets of the world's cities.

In the Philippines alone, 12 million children live and work on the city streets.

In Brazil, 7 million children live on the streets and another 17 million work on the streets, (statistics provided by Childhope Foundation).

EDUCATION

One-third of all children in the developing world are forced to drop out of school by age 10 to help with the family income. (UNICEF).

Nearly 100 million children of primary school age are not taking part in any education programs. (UNICEF).

EXPLOITATION

At least 100 million children are forced to work under hazardous and often fatal conditions for meager wages. (Defense for Children International).

In Thailand, there are as many as 40,000 prostitutes under the age of 14.

REFUGEES

Almost 70% of the worldwide refugee population are children (10 million). (Defense for Children International).

MALNUTRITION

Fifty percent of the children in the developing world do not have access to clean drinking water. (UNICEF).

Forty percent of children under the age of 5 suffer from malnutrition. (UNICEF).

In response to these concerns, House Resolution 312 resolves that it is the

sense of the House of Representatives that:

The issue of children's rights and well-being is important to both the United States and the world; and

The President should promptly submit the Convention on Rights of the Child to the Senate for its advice and consent.

Accordingly, I invite and urge my colleagues to support the resolution and I commend the distinguished Chairman of our House Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the committee's ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], the subcommittee's ranking minority member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for their efforts in bringing this bill to the floor at this time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us calls upon the President to submit the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child for ratification. The preamble to the Convention, as passed by the United Nations last November, is a marvelous expression of many of our deepest held beliefs about the dignity of the child, and indeed, all humanity.

But now, we must focus on what this Convention will mean when applied to American children. Will the Convention really solve the problems our children face? Is it merely an article of good intentions to make us feel good about ourselves? Or, is it actually a potential threat to some of our most precious freedoms, civil liberties, and our form of government?

What are we saying by adopting House Resolution 312? We are saying that we agree with the entirety of the Convention and desire that it become the law to be enforced throughout the United States. I submit that few Members understand what the Convention contains. I submit that this House has not taken the time to reflect upon the implications of the Convention and will be in for a tremendous shock when judges around the country start applying the Convention as the supreme law of the land.

Have we determined the impact that this Convention will have on our system of federalism? No. Have we resolved in our minds its inherent conflicts with the U.S. Constitution? I think not. Do we realize the great new powers Congress is taking away from the sovereign States, as well as giving up itself, to the judiciary? Who can ex-

plain to me the meaning of article 24 section 3 which provides that:

States parties shall take all effective and appropriate measures with a view to abolishing traditional practices prejudicial to the health of children.

Here is a new standard for us to ponder: Something need not be hazardous or even pose a risk—it need be only prejudicial to be abolished by government. Who will define what is prejudicial as this Convention takes effect?

Compare article 15 of the Convention with the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Article 15, section 1 provides that "State Parties recognize the rights of the child to freedom of association and to peaceful assembly." Of course, no one objects to this because it is so close to our own first amendment. But section 2 goes on to provide that:

No restrictions may be placed on the exercise of these rights other than those * * * which are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, public order, the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

This article is an open invitation to discriminate against any minority group you can think of.

This raises the critical difference between our Constitution and nearly any other. Our Constitution is a limitation on government. It is designed to protect the rights of the minority. I believe, and I would argue that Jefferson, Madison, and Mason would argue that the rights mentioned by the Convention are among our children's inalienable rights. However, this Convention is based on an underlying premise that rights come from the Government. Article 15 is really saying that only Government can endow us with these rights, and that whatever Government grants, it can also take away.

How many of us understand what article 14 will mean to our citizens? Who is ready to defend to this body the ramifications of the power of the Government to restrict freedom of religion if "necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others?" Let me tell my colleagues that there were no hearings on this resolution. So you have only a very few minutes to check with the various religious and civil liberties organizations to see how they feel about this language.

Judiciary needs to consider the vast constitutional implications of ratification. Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, Agriculture, and Ways and Means must consider what it would mean to establish and enforce "universal legal standards for the care and protection of children against neglect, exploitation, and abuse." Is Government child care necessary to ensure

that there are universal standards for the care of children? Or perhaps a judge somewhere might wish to argue that institutionalized child care is itself a form of neglect because children are exposed more frequently to illnesses.

What will it mean to enforce article 28, which makes "primary education compulsory and available free to all?" Will it mean subsidies to private or religious schools when read in conformance with article 29? Or could it mean the end to all private education?

This resolution should not be taken lightly. It was reported out of Foreign Affairs only last Thursday. As I just mentioned, there were no hearings, in the full committee. But now, as it faces possible domestic implementation, the Convention needs study and careful consideration, and I strongly urge this House to do so.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In responding to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] I would like to say that assuming the President submits the Convention to the Senate for ratification, it is important to note that the ratification process allows the Senate to attach reservations to those provisions in which there is U.S. opposition.

If the gentleman's concerns have merit, I would suspect that the ratification process will address the issues he has raised.

Mr. Speaker, also I want to point out it is important to note that successive U.S. administrations were involved from day one in the development of this Convention. President Bush's representative at the United Nations supported the passage of this convention at last year's General Assembly. I doubt very seriously that the Administration would support a Convention which undermined American interests and values.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that clarification. I think it is very important.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

□ 1500

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and the tribute to my home State, the Cornhusker State.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter before us, of course. I think the distinguished chairman of the committee has appropriately just responded to some of the concerns raised by our distinguished colleague and my personal friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

The United States has voted to support the convention when it was approved by the United Nations last November. House Resolution 312 merely asked the President to follow up on that initial vote of approval by sending the convention to the Senate for consideration.

This Member of Congress regards himself as strongly profamily. This resolution is endorsed by a very large number of Members of the House in one fashion or another including by significant and involved members of the Select Committee on Hunger who certainly fall in the category of being very concerned about children and very concerned as profamily.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who will speak soon, certainly falls in that category of being very concerned about family matters and very profamily. We do support this resolution, because we understand that the President will express reservations and submit reservations to the Senate about our possible ratification of this convention. We always do that. Almost every convention that the United States would be asked to act upon we have to have reservations, because we have a federal system, and we may not bind the States in many cases to action. We will have that same kind of reservation, so that we are not usurping the powers of the States.

I certainly do take exception to any suggestion that this will have an impact upon the civil liberties of the people of this country or the form of government that we pursue. Those concerns will, as always is the case, be handled by reservations which are submitted by the President.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has mentioned the prior involvement of a number of administrations in the crafting of the resolution that has been acted upon last November. I also think it is important to mention that the world summit on children will occur in 2 weeks. This has been a matter of particular interest to this Member and other members of the Foreign Affairs and Hunger Subcommittees.

This Member would like very much to urge the President to make every effort to submit the Convention on the Rights of the Child with reservations as appropriate before that summit. If it is impossible for some reason for those reservations to be fully spelled out, then realize it cannot be submitted to the Senate, but I believe that the administration is well prepared to identify the reservations related to our form of government, our civil liberties, and our right to practice religion, to mention only several of the items that were raised.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 312 is an important and timely resolution and this Member is pleased to have worked with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS], as well as various members of the Hunger Committee, to bring it before the committee.

Much has been done in recent years to root out the sources of infant and child mortality. It has been both a national and an international priority. As a result of child immunization and oral rehydration therapy, as many as 3,000,000 lives are saved each year. Major international 3,000,000 lives are saved each year. Major international efforts, including the U.S. Food for Peace Program, have sought to alleviate malnutrition as a killer of the world's young.

The United States can justifiably be proud of our efforts on child survival. But global efforts fall short of protecting children against neglect, exploitation, and abuse. The Convention on the Rights of the Child seeks to fill this gap. The convention establishes a coherent body of law that sets minimum standards to ensure healthy development of children. It highlights the importance of prenatal and postnatal care, as well as the importance of at least a primary education. The convention establishes protections against sexual exploitation and child labor exploitation. It also establishes procedures in matters of adoption and care for orphans. In short, the convention sets minimum levels of decency and humanity when dealing with the world's children.

Mr. Speaker, the United States voted to support the convention when it was approved by the United Nations last November. House Resolution 312 merely asks the President to followup that initial vote of approval by sending the convention to the Senate for consideration. And, to the extent that the administration has problems with specific provisions of the convention, it should and certainly will submit its reservations at the same time that it sends the convention to the Senate.

As a final note, the World Summit on Children will occur in 2 weeks. This has been a matter of particular interest to this member, and I have attempted to work closely with the State Department to ensure that the United States is properly represented and prepared with appropriate initiatives at this important meeting. This member is particularly pleased, therefore, that it is expected that President Bush and Secretary Baker will both be in attendance at the summit. Also, this Member would urge that the President make every effort to submit the Convention on the Rights of the Child with such reservations as appropriate, before that summit. The summit could and should provide the impetus for the ratification of the convention.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Throughout our history, Congress and our State legislatures have recognized the special vulnerability of children and their need for protection. It is time for the United States to carefully consider this convention and to encourage the rest of the world to implement its provisions.

Implementation of the provisions of the U.N. convention will give children the most important gift possible, a childhood. Children should not be treated as miniature adults. They should not have to fight adult wars. Their special status should be protected, so that they can learn the skills and develop the talents necessary to live full adult lives and fulfill their potential. I commend Messrs. YATRON, BEREUTER, OWENS, and SMITH for drafting this resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who will be my final speaker.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of House Resolution 312 introduced by my good friends, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], my chairman, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], both internationally known advocates for human rights and for children, whether it be child-survival initiatives or adoption or refugees; they have always been out in front on children's issues, and I want to commend them for that.

The resolution asks the President, Mr. Speaker, to submit the Convention on the Rights of the Child to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. I am very proud to be an original sponsor of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, on November 20 of last year, the U.N. General Assembly adopted the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the United States voted in favor of this international convention. On November 10, I had the privilege of presenting, as U.S. delegate to the U.S. mission to the U.N. General Assembly, the U.S. position on the convention during the debate in New York. Both before, and now subsequent to that vote, the administration has been, and I want to commend them for this, meticulously and judiciously considering the legal effects of the ratification of the convention. There are some concerns that have been raised, very thoughtful concerns that need and must be addressed in any package of reservations and understandings.

Generally speaking, questions of Federal and State sovereignty permeate most of the provisions of the convention. It is my understanding that the administration is compiling an appropriate package of reservations and understandings which will hopefully allay the fears of some of the Members including my good friend, the

gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] as he raised today. Hopefully this will speed ratification of the convention through the Senate.

Indeed, the Senate has a clear constitutional responsibility to clarify to make sure that the provisions of the convention do not in any way threaten the rights and protections enjoyed by American citizens, and in this particular case, those rights of children.

Mr. Speaker, as declared in the official United States statement on the convention, I would like to quote:

The United States fully supports the inclusion within the preamble of the convention language from the 1959 Declaration of the Rights of the Child confirming that "the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth."

Children—born and unborn—are precious and extremely vulnerable. Governments have a duty and sacred obligation to protect these children to the maximum extent possible.

The U.S. position goes on to say,

Birth is an event which happens to each of us. The most tender, formative 9 months prior to this great event will forecast the healthiness of the child after birth. One of the most positive protections for a healthy childhood—after life itself—is proper prenatal care.

Mr. Speaker, the statement goes on to point out and to emphasize the importance of family unification, the issue of abuse and neglect, the issue of adoption, particularly international adoptions, disabled children and the fact that so many children who are born disabled in many of the developing countries very often not only have very difficult lives but very often during the course of their teenage years lose their lives themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we all acknowledge that this convention is not a perfect document, but I would suggest to the Members that it is a solid foundation on which the entire gamut of protections can be structured within the legal framework of each country of the world.

Mr. Speaker, our children, in my view, are our greatest hope, among our generation. They deserve our protection. They deserve our loving care and the opportunity to achieve their best with their talents.

The adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child will serve, in my view, as a starting point, a launching pad for improving the status and the situation of all children, of all nationalities, of all creeds and of all social status.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to support this resolution.

Ms. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 312. This resolution expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should submit the United Nations Convention

the Rights of the Child for ratification by the Senate.

This is a historic document which for the first time guarantees children their basic needs, protections and freedoms in one binding instrument. I have consistently urged my colleagues and the administration to endorse this convention which establishes universal legal standards of care for children.

On November 16, I was joined by 40 of my colleagues in writing to President Bush to urge administration support for the convention. I worked closely with my friends at the foster parents plan in Rhode Island to organize this effort.

The value of the U.N. convention on children's rights cannot be underestimated. It will guard children from the dangers of illegal narcotics, child labor, and sexual exploitation while at the same time guaranteeing them access to primary health care services and education.

It has taken 10 years of careful negotiation and compromise among 42 countries and 30 nongovernmental organizations to bring the convention to fruition. It is high time we ratify this convention for the good of the children of the world.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, November 16, 1989.

PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH. On November 20, 1989 the United General Assembly is scheduled to vote on the Convention on the Rights of the Child. We are writing to express our support for this international treaty on children and to ask for your endorsement of a positive U.S. vote at the General Assembly.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child is a historic document which for the first time guarantees children their basic needs, protections and freedoms in one binding instrument. The idea of an international treaty for children was first proposed in 1979 as a contribution to the International Year of the Child. It has taken ten years of careful negotiation and compromise among 42 countries and 30 non-governmental organizations to bring the Convention to fruition. This agreement represents the next step in a progression of international children's rights declarations and statements which extend back more than 60 years.

Mr. President, we believe that the potential value of the UN Convention on children's rights—guarding children from the dangers of illegal narcotics, child labor, and sexual exploitation while at the same time guaranteeing them access to primary health care services and education—cannot be underestimated. However, we also believe that the ultimate power and strength of the Convention will depend to a large extent on the position the United States takes toward it now and in the future.

We therefore urge you to do all you can to ensure that the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child receives the strong endorsement of your administration when it comes before the General Assembly later this month.

Sincerely,

Donald Pease, George Miller, Claudine Schneider, John Porter, Les AuCoin, John LaFalce, Gary Ackerman, Tim Penny, Michael McNulty, Louise Slaughter, Barney Frank, Tony Hall, James Bilbray, Ben Cardin, Mo Udall,

Thomas Downey, Ron Machtley, Christopher Shays, Mike Espy, Edolphus Towns, Richard Neal, James Traficant, Charles Hayes, Jim Slatery, Nancy Pelosi, Wayne Owens, Pat Schroeder, Byron Dorgan, Peter Kostmayer, Robert Matsui, Lane Evans, Richard Durbin, Eliot Engel, Mervyn Dymally, Frank Horton, Thomas Foglietta, William Hughes, Howard Wolpe, Robert Wise, Jaime Fuster, Henry Waxman.

Members of Congress.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 312.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended, and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on House Resolution 312, the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REGARDING CONVENTION FOR PROTECTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC REGION

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 398) urging United States ratification of the Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 398

Whereas the Earth's fragile ecological system requires the attentive stewardship of Man;

Whereas water covers three-fourths of the Earth's surface, with the Pacific Ocean containing over half of the total volume;

Whereas the Earth's marine ecosystems are increasingly threatened due to expanding populations and industry and their accompanying residues and wastes;

Whereas Pacific governments adopted a South Pacific Regional Environment Program (hereinafter in the preamble of this resolution referred to as "SPREP") in 1982 at the Rarotonga Conference on the Human Environment, which was formed under the auspices of the United Nations Environmen-

tal Program, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the South Pacific, the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Cooperation, and the South Pacific Commission;

Whereas SPREP has two aspects, the Work Program and the Convention, to address Pacific Ocean environmental concerns;

Whereas the United States is supporting the SPREP Work Program budget directed toward marine pollution, pesticide control, natural resources management, environmental education, climate change, and sea level rise;

Whereas the SPREP Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region was opened for signature in Noumea, New Caledonia on November 24, 1986, 14 countries having signed the Convention;

Whereas the Convention has two protocols on ocean dumping and spills;

Whereas the first protocol for the Prevention of Pollution of the South Pacific Region by Dumping, regulates the deliberate disposal of wastes at sea in the Convention Area, taking into account that under Article X of the Convention the parties agree not to dump radioactive wastes or other radioactive matter;

Whereas the second protocol, the Protocol Concerning Cooperation in Combating Pollution Emergencies in the South Pacific Region, provides a regime for preventing and combating pollution incidents through the mutual sharing of information, preparation of contingency plans, and strengthening of response capabilities; and

Whereas the Convention will enter into force following the deposit of at least 10 instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, and 10 have already been deposited; Now, therefore be it Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the President should submit the Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region, and (as necessary) the related protocols, in appropriate form to Congress;

(2) upon the submission of such Convention and protocols to Congress, the Congress should without delay consider them and consent to ratification in order to permit full participation and cooperation of the United States in the South Pacific Regional Environment Program effort to protect and manage the marine and coastal environment, to combat pollution emergencies, and to prevent dumping; and

(3) the United States should commit a fair share of the resources necessary to support—

(A) the Work Program of the South Pacific Regional Environment Program, and

(B) those activities necessary to implement the provisions of the Convention and its protocols.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michi-

gan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON].

□ 1510

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Resolution 398, I want to commend Congressman LAGOMARSINO for this vital initiative, and for his leadership on South Pacific environmental issues. Let me also commend Chairman SOLARZ and Congressman BEREUTER for their strong interest in preserving the environment of the Pacific area. Let me also commend Congressman BROOMFIELD, Congressman SMITH of New Jersey, and Chairman FASCELL for their efforts on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, in 1982 Pacific governments adopted the South Pacific Regional Environmental Program. It has two aspects. One is the work program. The second is the Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region.

The convention has two extremely important protocols. The first regulates ocean dumping and the other provides a mechanism to address the growing problem of spills.

The deliberate disposal of wastes, including radioactive matter, and other pollution problems, are increasingly threatening the marine and coastal resources of the Pacific which are so critical to the prosperity and stability of the countries in that region. American economic and security interests are also closely tied to the environmental integrity of the Pacific.

The resolution calls on the President to submit the convention and its protocols to the Senate for its advice and consent, and for the Senate to act expeditiously toward ratification. The participation and cooperation of the United States in the convention will be a critical step in protecting the environment of the South Pacific region.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 398 is bipartisan, noncontroversial, and was drafted with the cooperation of the administration. It was approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee, as amended. I ask my colleagues for their support of this measure.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] for his work as the principal sponsor of this resolution in support of the South Pacific Regional Environmental Protection Convention.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs and the Interior Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, he will understand the importance for the United States of entering

into regional arrangements with the Pacific island states.

I also want to thank Chairman FASCELL for seeing that this matter was expeditiously considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee. In addition, I commend Mr. SOLARZ and the members of the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee for giving it their support.

The United States signed the Convention in 1982, and has cooperated on the work plan for environmental protection developed under the convention. U.S. activities in the South Pacific are also completely consistent with the provisions of the convention and its protocols. It is time the United States ratified this agreement, which will reinforce the image of our country in the South Pacific region.

I understand that the Department of State supports adoption of this resolution. I trust the administration will soon submit the convention to Congress for its approval to ratification.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would say preliminarily that this legislation is one more bit of evidence about the outstanding and irreplaceable knowledge and expertise of our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. Speaker, given the increased awareness of the delicate nature of our environment, it is not surprising that the island nations of the South Pacific would wish to preserve their natural resources. These nations have a right to be concerned. In recent years the South Pacific has been troubled by the dumping of large amounts of hazardous waste at sea, by oil spills, and by destructive fishing practices such as the use of drift nets.

In order to better manage their environment, the South Pacific nations joined together to establish a work comprehensive program, and to draft a Convention on the Protection of Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region. This convention, adopted in 1986, establishes basic standards of behavior for waste disposal and other environmentally critical matters.

The United States strongly supports the efforts of the South Pacific nations, but has failed to act on the convention. The resolution before us today urges the Senate to provide its advice and consent, and that the United States become a party to this convention.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 398 expresses the view that the United States must take an active role in international environmental policy. Environmental degradation affects us all. By joining with the Pacific island nations and becoming a party to the convention, we will be playing a con-

structive role in the preservation of that very fragile ecosystem.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would recognize the efforts of our two colleagues from the South Pacific region, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. BLAZ] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA]. This gentleman would also commend the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. SAIKI], who has long been a leader in matters affecting the Pacific region. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] deserve commendation for allowing speedy subcommittee consideration of this resolution.

Last, but most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman wishes to recognize the efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], the author of this resolution. The gentleman has labored diligently, and has gained a thorough understanding of the policy issues affecting the South Pacific. He is to be commended for bringing this important and balanced resolution before this body. I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of House Resolution 398, and would urge its speedy adoption.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to join in supporting the passage of House Resolution 398, urging U.S. ratification of the Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific region. The resolution was unanimously approved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, having been favorably reported by both the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations and the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. The Convention has two protocols dealing with the ocean dumping of wastes and pollution emergencies. The protocols should help to prevent or avert the damaging consequences of the ecological tragedies of oil spills and hazardous waste pollution in the South Pacific.

The United States has an opportunity to join in an international effort to preserve and protect one of the Earth's greatest resources, the oceans; and specifically the South Pacific ocean region, by approving and supporting the convention and related protocols. The United States should fully participate in developing and implementing the practical mechanisms provided for by the Convention which are needed to protect the marine ecosystem. This can be done most creditably by those parties which have approved the Convention and protocols.

The United States signed the Convention and related protocols in 1986 with 13 other countries. The adminis-

tration is still engaged in the internal executive branch process necessary for ratification. Ten ratifications or accessions are required to bring the convention into force. When I introduced the legislation in May, eight countries had deposited notices of ratification or accession. The total number is now 10 with the ratification by France and Western Samoa. The convention entered into force on August 23, 1990.

It is now imperative for the administration to promptly submit the convention and protocols in appropriate form to the Congress for action. The United States should be fully involved as a ratifying member in all discussions and activities which will now ensue to implement the convention.

I want to acknowledge the support of my colleagues who have joined me in sponsoring this resolution, including the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, my good friend from New York, STEVE SOLARZ. Chairman SOLARZ recently issued a report of the congressional delegation to the South Pacific which he led, "Problems in Paradise: United States Interests in the South Pacific." One of the report's recommendations for U.S. policy in the region is to ratify SPREP Convention and associated protocols. The recommendation was one of several which will enhance U.S. relations in the Pacific.

I want to thank Chairman FASCELL and ranking Republican, Mr. BROOMFIELD, for their support. I also want to thank Chairman YATRON of the Human Rights and International Organizations Subcommittee for considering and supporting the resolution, and ranking Republican DOUG BEREUTER and CHRIS SMITH of the same subcommittee, as well as ranking Republican JIM LEACH of the Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee, and three Members from the Pacific, BEN BLAZ, ENI FALEOMAVAEGA, and PAT SAIKI, for joining this effort to urge the administration and the Congress to take prompt action to approve the Convention and protocols to protect the fragile and invaluable marine resources and ecosystems of the Pacific.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 398 which urges ratification by the United States of the Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region.

The United States initially signed this Convention in 1986, however, the administration has not yet taken necessary steps for ratification. When the Solarz congressional delegation went to the South Pacific, we found strong support among many South Pacific leaders for the convention. This subsequently led to the inclusion in our official codal report of a firm recommendation calling for the ratification of the SPREP Convention and Protocols.

Mr. Speaker, immediate passage of this resolution is now even more significant given the recent decision by the United States Army to destroy chemical weapons at Johnston Island, the reckless nuclear testing by the French Government at Mururoa Atoll, and the ever-increasing use of the Pacific Ocean as a dumping ground for the world's toxic wastes.

In light of these events, passage of this resolution and ultimate ratification of this convention will most certainly demonstrate the leading, international role the United States can play in protecting the South Pacific Ocean, and demonstrate its sensitivity to those issues which are of vital importance to the people of the South Pacific. After all, the United States is also a Pacific country in that five of its Western States and two of its territories border the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, the SPREP Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region sets forth two key protocols on ocean dumping and oil spills. The first protocol regulates the deliberate disposal of wastes at sea. The second protocol provides a regime for preventing and combating pollution through the mutual sharing of information, preparation of contingency plans and for strengthening our capability to respond. These two key protocols should go a long way toward preventing the tragedies of oil spills and the dumping of hazardous waste in our Pacific Ocean.

As one of the original cosponsors of this piece of legislation, I want to commend and pay special tribute to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], for his leadership and foresight as the chief sponsor and author of this bill. I also want to thank Chairman SOLARZ, Congressman DORNAN, Congressman NEAL SMITH, Congressman BEN BLAZ, and Congresswoman PAT SAIKI for their leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this resolution.

□ 1520

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 398, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on House Resolution 398, the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 3033) to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow free mailing privileges to be extended to members of the Armed Forces while engaged in temporary military operations under arduous circumstances.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3033

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3401(a)(1)(A) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting "engaged in temporary military operations under arduous circumstances," before "or serving".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Personnel and Modernization, I rise in strong support of S. 3033 and urge my colleagues to unanimously approve it. This legislation allows military personnel deployed in temporary overseas military operations to mail letters to their loved ones in the United States free of charge.

Members of this body who visited the Persian Gulf during the August recess, report that our service men and women were quite disturbed because they have been unable to obtain the necessary postage that would enable them to communicate with their families.

Granting free mailing privileges is the least we should do to ensure that the morale of our Armed Forces personnel in overseas military operations remains high. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this modest benefit to our troops deployed in Operation Desert Shield and future special military operations.

If cleared by the House, S. 3033 could be on the President's desk for signature today.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is essentially the same language in the bill that the House had before it last Thursday. I do apologize to my colleagues, my chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES], for a misunderstanding from this side about what was taking place at that time. I gave the gentleman some information that to the best of my knowledge did exist over here, but I found out later that I did not have the proper information because I had not asked quite the right question.

What happened last Thursday, we had similar legislation. We had an agreement from the Postmaster General that he was already starting to accept mail from the Persian Gulf from our service people with merely a "free" put on the envelope in place of a stamp. He had to withdraw that because we were unable to deliver the legislation; so I do apologize to my colleagues for misrepresenting to them, inadvertently. I certainly did not intend to do that, I just do not do business that way, so I do apologize to my colleagues and to the Postmaster General for our promise to him, our commitment that we would put that legislation through last week so our service people could have started last week, instead of now waiting until probably tomorrow until the President gets this signed; but everyone I think who was here last Friday and knows what the issue is, our service people who are serving a cause in the Middle East and in the Persian Gulf particularly, Desert Shield, are unable in many cases to purchase the stamps for them to correspond back home.

Once they do purchase them, the stamps because of the tremendous heat in the desert, the glue on the stamps is melting and sticking together, but assuming they get the stamp apart, and I am told they affix it on the envelope and the stamp falls off because the glue has already been spent, so they have a real problem there. The least we can do is provide free postage to these young people, paid from the Defense Department.

This is a Senate bill. It is a clean bill. I hope there will not be any misunderstanding here or any commotion, as happened last week. It is very badly needed and certainly deserved by the young people who are serving in the Persian Gulf at a tremendous cost, not only to themselves, their families, but the tremendous heat and the environment they are serving in there. They are serving a cause and we owe it to them to get this passed today. It should have been done last week, so I am sorry to the service people that we did not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking

Republican member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to seek the support of my colleagues for passage of legislation to provide a free mailing privilege to our men and women serving us in the Saudi desert.

S. 3033 is similar to the measure we debated last Thursday, H.R. 5611 and to which a vote on a motion to recommit is pending in the House. This motion contains instructions for our committee to bring H.R. 5611 back to the floor with an amendment authorizing the payment of the postage due portion of the cost of providing this service to be extracted from our franking budget, as contained in the legislative appropriations bill. Existing statutes provide that the Department of Defense shall reimburse the U.S. Postal Service for all expenses, postage due and transportation, that are incurred by the Postal Service in providing this service.

Mr. colleagues this legislation should have been signed into law last week. The Postmaster General, Tony Frank, announced last Wednesday at our committee hearing on this subject that the Postal Service would place these provisions into effect immediately. However, the Department of Defense continues to need this amendment to begin to accept this type of mail from our military personnel in the Persian Gulf.

My colleagues, let us not quibble over how this expense is paid. Let us not delay any longer this important piece of legislation. These dedicated men and women are in that desert, far away from their loved ones and from their homes on our behalf.

We cannot guarantee them they will be back home soon, though we pray they will be. We cannot guarantee that they will not be involved in a hostile action though we pray and hope that they will not be. But we can guarantee them that their correspondence and their ability to stay in contact with their friends and family will be as unfettered as possible.

We can insure that they have the ability to stay in touch with those here in the United States as much as possible. While this will not bring them home any sooner it will, hopefully, ease the burden that both, they over there and we here at home, who care for them, must bear until this difficulty is resolved.

Accordingly, the Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this measure.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES], the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Postal Personnel and Modernization; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], a senior member of that subcommittee; the distinguished chairman of our Post Office and Civil Service Commit-

tee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORB], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY], who has been one of the leaders on this measure, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON]. I thank them for their support of this measure.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his remarks, and our chairman.

I will add here that I hope the legislation, the action we are taking today, will be in effect necessary only temporarily. We all hope and pray that the forces can be pulled back very soon, but that depends upon action by someone else.

I do want to make one other statement here. I understand there must be brought forward a vote on the recommitment yet today. That would be a moot question once this legislation passes, but should anyone wish to vote for it, I will advise you that for the last 2 years we have been running this House of Representatives from the account for franking where the recommitment money would come from at a deficit. Right now we are advised the deficit is running about \$34 million, maybe \$35 million in the hole, in the red right at this moment, so there would be no money to pay for this postage if that legislation prevail. So anyone who has ideas about paying it from our own account, we do not have any money to pay it from, and this money would come out of the Defense Department where it probably should be and always in the history of our country when we have had this action before has always been paid from defense funds, and that is where this would be paid from on this bill. This is the logical and correct way to do it, so I urge everyone to support this legislation. Let us not delay this any further.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker I would like to add my complete support for this legislation.

This is among the most simple gestures we members of a legislative body can make in support of the brave young men and women who are unselfishly serving international interests in the Middle East. This legislation may seem to be a trivial to many, but I can assure my colleagues that to those who have been separated by their loved ones, free postage for our soldiers and expedited service of their letters will truly help make their uncomfortable stay in the desert a little more bearable.

I applaud my colleagues for acting so quickly on this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, the U.S. Postal Service announced that effective immediately troops deployed to Operation Desert Shield can mail correspondence home free of postage. The Postal Service made this important and timely announcement subsequent to the Senate adoption of lan-

guage in the Treasury-Postal Service Appropriations bill on September 11 and because House approval of similar legislation was imminent.

In making this announcement the Postmaster General said that

Now our military personnel in Operation Desert Shield can send their messages to friends and loved ones back home without postage. The Postal Service fully supports our service men and women. We'll take all the letters they give us.

The legislation before us today puts the House of Representatives firmly on record in staunch support of this action as well.

Members of a recent congressional delegation visiting the troops in Saudi Arabia found that a common complaint was that the troops were unable to purchase stamps to mail letters home, and that if they had brought stamps with them, the desert heat made them unusable.

S. 3033 authorizes members of the Armed Forces engaged in temporary military operations overseas under arduous circumstances to mail cards, letters, and audio cassettes home without postage. Thus, the bill would extend to troops currently in Saudi Arabia the same free mailing privileges that current law extends to members of the Armed Forces engaged in hostilities.

By writing the word "free" in the upper right-hand corner and by placing their name, military grade and complete military address in the upper left-hand corner, the troops can send their letters home without stamps.

I strongly support this legislation as it is entirely appropriate to accord free mailing privileges to the servicemen and women who are bravely and selflessly serving our country in the Persian Gulf. It had been suggested that it may be required to delete funds from the mailing privileges of the House of Representatives for that purpose and I am fully prepared to support such legislative action should it be necessary to defray the cost.

We all owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the members of the U.S. Armed Forces who are serving in the gulf region and this legislation is the least we can do to assure that they keep in close and frequent contact with their loved ones by mail.

I urge its swift adoption.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, despite our Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf being involved in the largest military buildup since the Vietnam war, they couldn't perform the simple task of mailing a letter home to their families and friends. That's because the law said they couldn't have free mailing privileges unless they were under hostile fire.

But they needed this privilege because—as they have told our congressional delegations—the sheer heat and living conditions in the Persian Gulf precluded the availability and use of stamps. The Postal Service has agreed and in anticipation of passage of S. 3033, has begun accepting free mail from the troops.

This is why I am urging quick passage of S. 3033, to confirm free mailing privileges to our men and women serving in Operation Desert Shield. We need this legislation to continue the same privilege to today's military men and women as we have given to our troops in Vietnam, Korea, and the World Wars.

Mr. Speaker, the troops are waiting for us to act today on this legislation. The U.S. Postal Service has acted. The Department of Defense is ready to act as soon as this bill becomes law. If we pass it now, it can be on the President's desk today!

Our young men and women have earned this extra benefit because of the harsh and extreme circumstances we have asked them to live and work under. We have sent them thousands of miles from their families and friends, and this free mail plan may help them come a little closer together.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana, and my colleague, and the gentleman from New York for their consistent support for this legislation, as well as the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCloskey] who have a companion piece of legislation similar to this that we talked about the other day.

They are all strong supporters.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 3033.

The question was taken.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on S. 3033, the Senate bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor to introduce Supreme Court Justice Kennedy at a function in New York City. Because of this event, I unfortunately missed two votes on the floor.

The first bill was S. 3033, a Senate bill to authorize members of the Armed Forces engaged in temporary military operations overseas under arduous circumstances to mail cards, letters, and audio cassettes home without postage. Thus, the bill extends to troops

currently in Saudi Arabia the same free mailing privileges that current law extends to members of the Armed Forces engaged in hostilities. Funding for this bill would come from the defense budget.

The second bill was Representative RIDGE's motion to recommit H.R. 5611, the House version of S. 3033. An important difference from S. 3033 is that funding for H.R. 5611 would be provided from the congressional franking budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would have voted for both bills, and I would like the Record to show my positions on the bills, as well as my regret on having missed these votes.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS TODAY

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess today, until no later than 5 p.m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I do think we need to probably tell the House what it is we are attempting to accomplish here.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the necessity for this is to give the people at the budget summit additional time to work.

What we would hope to do is cluster all votes that have been ordered as a result of suspensions, plus other items of business that may require votes, into a time period between 5 and 6 o'clock and then the House could be expected to adjourn for the day sometime shortly after 6 o'clock.

Is that a correct reading of the situation? And I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am advised the gentleman is correct in his assumption.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It would be the intention of the Chair to call the special orders at this point.

With the understanding that the House will return to regular legislative business today, the Chair will now call the special orders.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES EXPRESS CONCERN OVER POSSIBILITY OF A FURLOUGH

(Mr. HAYES of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been getting quite a bit of inquiries from employees in the Postal Service about some of the recent decisions that have been made that will affect their employment as a result of the efforts of the summit conference. I guess, to reach agreement on the budget.

One of the things that concerns our people is being forced to take leave, and they are concerned about the impact it would have upon their family life.

This is not only true of employees of the postal system, but it is true of all Federal employees.

To be in a position where you have to take time off and lose income amidst an effort to reduce the deficit, it is hitting where it hits the most those people who can least afford it.

I really think we ought to consider in this House speaking out and standing up for those people who are going to be impacted adversely by this kind of action. We ought to find a way to reduce the deficit, but not on the backs of those who can least afford it but on the backs of what we spend in the military and, yes, in the forgiveness of the debts of other countries who can pay, at the expense of our people who live here.

□ 1540

STOP PROTECTING THE SUPER-RICH AND GOUGING WORKING FAMILIES!

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. At the end of World War II, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. economy stood astride the world like a colossus. Virtually every other economy in the Western world was in collapse. America's economy drove the world economy, and the American worker was king.

For the first 25 years after World War II, the American worker knew unparalleled prosperity. During those years the family which was exactly in the middle of all income earners saw its real income doubled. Middle-class income rose more rapidly than income for the wealthy because wages went up. Eighty percent of the increased income in America in those days came from increased wages.

However, Mr. Speaker, the world economy was changing, and the energy crisis in 1973 revealed which economies were ready to handle those changes and which were not. From 1973 to 1978, a male worker at the exact middle of American earners saw the purchasing power of his wages actually decline by 2 percent because of

inflation. From 1978 to 1988, average hourly earnings measured in terms of their purchasing power declined a full dollar, from \$11.72 to \$10.13, figuring both of those numbers in 1988 dollars. That meant that the worker in the middle lost \$2,000 in real purchasing power over that decade.

Why did that happen? It happened essentially for three reasons. First, foreign countries expanded their sales for traditional products, such as cars; second, American manufacturers failed to win the competition for production and sale of new products, such as VCR's; and, third, management succeeded in pushing down wages under the pressure of international competition, even while executive compensation was skyrocketing.

Over the eighties, families on the surface appeared to be keeping up, but only because more and more women went into the work force, producing second earners for many American families. In 1978, the total income of two-parent families was \$969 billion. In 1980, the total income was \$1,044 billion. But fathers' earnings had dropped from \$806 billion to \$789 billion. Mothers' income had increased from \$161 billion to \$255 billion. America witnessed a 20-percent increase in the number of woman who worked full or part time and a 100-percent increase in mothers who worked full time. Mothers' income over that period added an average of about \$3,400 to family income, but most of that income went to women in high-income families. For families in the exact middle of the country, in terms of income, mothers' wages increased family income by about \$1,250. But expenses, such as transportation, clothing, and child care, took away 20 to 30 percent of that income, enough to still make many families net losers.

Mr. Speaker, in the early 1980's the Reagan administration argued that reducing Government involvement in the economy and cutting taxes primarily for high-income people would create a new era of generalized prosperity. But the record shows that, as regulatory enforcement has been cut, as antitrust litigation has been mothballed, public investment cut in half and tax rates on high income people cut by more than 50 percent, the purchasing power of workers paid through wages has actually fallen.

Putting two earners in the work force helped many families to be able to feel that they could afford to have children, or buy a home, or think about putting their kids through college, but economic strains on mothers are putting strains on other aspects of family life, and, unless both Government and private industry helps to adapt to those new realities, the price of that strain will fall most heavily on today's children.

Today at Andrews Air Force Base discussions are now going on between the White House and the congressional leaders to try to determine how to reduce the gargantuan deficits created by the fiscal mismanagement of the 1980's. It is about time. But any attempt to deal with those budget deficits through increased taxes should take into account the fact that many middle class families have reaped few, if any, of the benefits of the policies which caused those deficits.

Let us take a look, for just a moment, at the result of Government budget and tax policy in the 1980's. In terms of income the wealthiest 1 percent of people in our society have seen their incomes rise by about 70 percent, from \$313,000 to well over \$500,000 on average during the 1980's. By contrast, the income for the 20 percent of families in the middle rose by a scant 3 percent. And income for the poorest 20 percent of American families has actually declined. If we were to take the bottom 90 percent of all American families, we would see that they have had but a tiny fraction of the growth in income which has been provided for the wealthiest people in this society. The richest 1 million families saw their income go from \$313,000 on average to \$550,000 today. Forty percent of the total income growth in the country went to the richest 1 percent of people in this country. This is greater than the combined growth in income of 90 percent of all American families.

This year, Mr. Speaker, the richest 1 percent of the population will make \$564 billion before taxes. That is more than the total income of 40 percent of all American families. The most well off, 20 percent of American families, those making more than \$60,000 a year, will have more income this year than the other 80 percent of all American families combined: \$2.2 trillion versus \$2.1 trillion. If tax payments for the richest 1 percent of Americans had kept pace exactly with their income rise since 1980, the deficit today would be \$75 billion lower than it is today, and they would still have, after taxes, the largest increase in income of any other group in our society.

On taxes, if we combined all income and all payroll taxes, 60 percent of all American families—the bottom 60 percent—have actually had a tax increase. The second highest 20 percent of American families have had a tax cut of about \$45 on average. But the richest 1 percent have had an average income tax cut of \$12,000.

In addition, the Federal Government has shifted \$95 billion in responsibility from the Federal Government to State and local governments, about \$1,000 for every family in the country. For instance, if the Federal Government today were paying the same percent-

age of education costs that it paid 10 years ago at the elementary and secondary level, local property taxes for education would be \$10 billion lower. That shift also falls most heavily on low- and middle-income families because they pay a larger share of State and local taxes in comparison to the wealthy than they pay at the Federal level.

Yet in the wake of all of this the President last week asked us to support a tax package which adds \$25 billion to the deficit over 5 years and gives 80 percent of the benefits of those tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our society.

Now the argument made by the Reagan revolutionaries, that the average working families would eventually benefit from the policies of the 1980's, simply has not panned out. The evidence is in. Their promises were wrong. Most workers are paying higher taxes, and they have less purchasing power for their incomes than they had before. They did not get a gold plated invitation to the party in the 1980's, and they should be the last to get the bill for that party. But the President has put them first in line to pay. He and his negotiators at Andrews Air Force Base are insisting on passage of his capital gains proposal.

□ 1550

The richest 1 percent this year will have \$175,000 in capital gains. The bottom 90 percent of American households will have an average capital gain of \$299. That is \$175,000 versus \$299. And 80 percent of the benefit of the President's new capital gains plan will go to the richest 1 percent.

Now, the administration continues its adamant refusal to eliminate the gimmick in the Tax Code known as the bubble. That gimmick, shown on this chart, produces the following result: If you are a taxpayer earning less than \$42,000 a year under the existing tax code which the White House is trying to protect, you pay on that income a tax rate of about 15 percent. On income which ranges between \$42,000 and \$75,000, you pay a marginal tax rate of 28 percent. On income between \$75,000 and \$155,000, as shown by this graph, you pay a marginal tax rate of 33 percent, but on all income above \$155,000 the effective marginal tax rate drops back to 28 percent. This gap, this drop in income tax marginal rates for all people making more than \$155,000 a year costs the Treasury \$9 billion a year. That little special deal for all people making \$155,000 a year or more is what the President's negotiators are principally trying to protect in the tax debate now going on at the summit.

Now, because the President is taking some heat for the injustice of that position, his negotiators are now saying, "Well, why don't we instead pay for

the capital gains by limiting the tax deduction for State and local taxes?" They claim that that socks the rich. The problem is that it does so selectively. States such as Governor Sununu's State—the President's principal adviser—have no income tax. States such as Texas have no income tax. They simply charge the cost of their public services to consumers of oil and gas from other States who must buy their products in order to heat their homes and run their tractors.

If deductions for State and local taxes are limited, what appears on the surface to be limiting tax cuts for the wealthy in certain States will in fact simply create pressure for those States to lower tax rates on high-income individuals to the deductibility ceiling levels, which would simply result in those States shifting tax burdens to lower income people. I have very little doubt that that is what the President's advisers would like to do. I have a lot of doubt that what they want to do is fair and right.

To finance a capital gains tax gift for the rich everywhere by eliminating deductions for high-income people in only certain States would be unfair and would place an additional burden on States which have already done the most to deal with their own problems. States with progressive income taxes, such as New York, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, impose a heavier tax on high-income people than most other States, so we can deal with our own problems. We also receive smaller reimbursements from the Federal Government for the cost of programs such as Medicaid than do many States with little or no State income tax. That is hardly a just formula, but that is a fact.

The administration is now throwing up a smokescreen to try to cloud the public's view of the fact that what is preventing agreement at the summit on deficit reduction is the administration's insistence on protecting the very wealthy in the indefensible income tax bubble which I have just talked about. Their insistence on providing yet another tax benefit to the most high-flying citizens of this society by way of the capital gains tax break coincides with their ideological preference in preserving high-income people on the existing Income Tax Code.

That may make ideological sense, but it makes no economic sense, and it certainly is not fair. That in my view is what must change if we are to have a compromise on the budget deficit which solves the Nation's problems and once again gives the American people confidence that Government is looking for ways to help them rather than "take" them.

Now, the question is often asked: Why are people so cynical about politics and about politicians? Well, one answer to that that is often given is

that they are concerned about the ethics of people in Government.

I agree with that, and I think my record shows that I have been at the center of virtually every effort to strengthen ethics codes for elected officials, especially Members of Congress, and to reform ways in which political campaigns obtain and spend money.

But I would suggest that there is an even more important reason why the public thinks that they are being had by so many politicians, and that is because Government is seen as being quite different than it was at the time of World War II.

At the end of World War II, Government was seen as being on the side of the average family. It was supporting programs which helped people buy their first home and helped to put people through school through the VA housing program and the GI bill. Government was seen as having a progressive Tax Code which taxed people on the basis of their ability to pay, not on the basis of their ability to conduct public relations campaigns to get out of paying.

Today, Government unfortunately is seen as being in cahoots with the high-rollers in this society. It is being seen accurately, I am ashamed to say, as being on the side of the wealthy. It is seen as being the instrument which puts the fix in so that the wealthy and the well-connected can do exactly what they did in the 1980's, increase their income by gargantuan amounts at the same time they are reducing their tax burden in comparison to that income, leaving middle-income taxpayers holding the bag.

That has been the sad story of the 1980's on budget and tax policies, and that is what has to change. The single most important thing that any Government official can do to restore public confidence is to put Government back on the side of average families in this country by seeing to it that our deficit is reduced quickly and fairly. That means reducing the temptation to use the Persian Gulf crisis as an excuse to resurrect spending for every "turkey" weapons system that drains our strength rather than adds to it—weapons which have absolutely nothing to do with our ability to fight in the Persian Gulf.

□ 1600

I am talking about items like the B-2 bomber, star wars, the MX missile, and the like.

The second thing we must do is to say "No!" when the President's economic team is insisting that we once again provide just one more benefit to the wealthy at the expense of the average working family in this country. The tax system simply must be made more progressive. Those at the very

top of the income tax scale ought to be paying a higher tax rate than the rest of Americans, not a lower tax rate, as they are paying today, because if they do not, then people in the middle are simply going to get stuck.

Any so-called budget compromise coming out of Andrews Air Force Base that does not make those changes falls to meet the fundamental test of fairness and should be rejected. That is the message the President must understand.

For Republican negotiators at the summit to propose a package which cuts taxes for people at the top of the ladder, while raising taxes for everyone with incomes less than \$50,000, is backward.

The President indicated in his speech last Tuesday that he wanted us to stop fighting and come to an agreement on the budget deficit. I would love to see that happen. But before it can happen, people have to understand what the fighting is all about. The fighting is primarily about this gap, this gimmick, which allows the very richest people in our society to get off paying \$9 billion less a year than they should be paying into the Federal Treasury, while people who are making smaller incomes are paying more.

That is what the White House must face, that is what the White House must recognize, if they are to in the end gain the support of progressives in this House, who feel that the principal job of Government in this budget compromise is to see to it that middle-income working families are treated fairly, and to see to it that people who were not invited to the party in the 1980's do not get stuck with the lion's share of the bill.

THE POLITICS OF THE TEXTILE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the offices of the Congress have been inundated with mail, both for and against the Textile, Shoe, Apparel Act of 1990. Newspapers have run large display ads, both pro and con, and the U.S. Trade Representative's office has released statements daily threatening that passage of the legislation would destroy 4 years of GATT negotiations.

As a writer, as an editor, as a former Agency head responsible for international negotiations, I would like to make some comments upon what we are seeing and what we are hearing.

The charge that restricting the growth of imports of fabric, shoes and apparel to 1 percent a year is catastrophic is balderdash. No country is threatened with losing either quotas

or market share. No country is being shut out of American markets as we have been shut out of so many foreign markets.

The charge that the passage of this bill, H.R. 4328, will destroy the GATT Agreement is ridiculous. It is well understood among every professional in the field that the passage of the recent farm bill with all of its subsidies put the skids to any demands we were making to gain access to foreign markets or to push our demand of our trading partners that they stop subsidizing their producers.

As a matter of fact, the agricultural issue has bogged the whole process down so much that on Monday of last week, in a speech in Seattle, Ambassador Carla Hills is quoted in the Journal of Commerce as saying that:

Slashing farm subsidies that "bride the market" is a major goal of the current round of GATT talks, but it is unclear how much progress can be made before the conclusion of the talks in December.

When the American Congress decided to provide protection for the American farmer, a deserved benefit in a high risk business, Mrs. Hills—as a negotiator—was left high and dry.

So we are left in a quandry!

How can we ask foreign nations to forego that which our own people demands?

Of course these negotiations will go on into December and most likely will bear no fruit at all, unless possibly, there is something else to trade off which might make those countries open up markets long closed.

Now, what in the world could that be? Textiles? Shoes? Clothing? Is it possible that the shrillness of the attacks on the textile bill grows out of a real threat that the U.S. Trade Representative—having lost on the farm bill, also might be faced with the Congress' decision to protect 2 million American manufacturing jobs? That the textile and apparel industry will not be available to offer up to the goals of this negotiation?

I think this is the bottom line.

Now, if this indeed happens. If we trade 2 million manufacturing jobs for agricultural markets, I doubt the European Community will move 1 inch because right now, in the south of France, the sheep farmers are fighting importation from Great Britain of lamb—inside the European Community. The French farmers are being put out of business by opening up their markets to the British. The integration of markets inside the European Community is still under dispute—still unsettled.

In the matter of protecting its textiles and apparel industries, the whole of the European Community accepts only 25 percent of foreign production, even though they have a market 80 million stronger than ours. The Japanese market, half our size accepts only

6 percent. We, right now, are accepting 60 percent of world production and under this legislation would allow that to grow at 1 percent per year.

And, as to how the Japanese will respond to any new agreements, all we have to do is look at recent history of another supposedly successful agriculture negotiation with them.

Recall the fight over getting American beef and fish into Japan? How, even as we kissed off microprocessors—we gained entry to Japan on meat. A great victory of the last couple of years!

And do you know when that entry was made? That agriculture beef agreement was concluded after Japanese interests bought ranches and packing houses in the United States. Probably they allowed fish imports from United States waters after they brought canneries here. So, sure beef and fish are major U.S. export items to Japan, but it is Japanese-owned beef, Japanese-processed fish; and not one penny of the profit from these operations is kept in this country. And, at one of the ranches, even the cowboys are Japanese.

□ 1610

If we allow our textile industry, the remainder of our shoe and apparel industry to be traded off against promises of future markets—I suggest there will be a boom in the purchase of farms and paddies by foreign interests to pre-empt the profit of these agreed-upon imports.

To make my point, consider 5 of the 10 major exports to Japan from America.

Wood products and cork: And every Member of this House must be aware that little of this wood moves off milled. Value added is added in Japan, not in America.

Beef: Most of the beef going into Japan from the United States is owned by Japanese interests.

Fish: Most of the fish being exported is being sold by Japanese-owned fishing operations and processed through Japanese operated canneries.

Grain cereals: If Japan is buying grain cereals from the United States, Japanese trading houses also are operating out of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the Export Enhancement Program receiving grain for shipments of grain—to targeted markets—through the program. So, in what is becoming "the Japanese model," if we enter one market, they in turn move in as equals making up any United States gain in another area.

The final major export is non-ferrous metals. In the last 2 years, Japan has purchased or bought into several nonferrous metal operations, so how much of this export item should be

credited to the United States or to Japan is in question.

I have been attacked in an advertisement—paid for by Japanese interests—in *Time* magazine for suggesting that we are becoming a colony of Japan. If we look at the products Japan buys from us—the five I just listed—agriculture and raw materials—and consider that we are not only buying manufactured goods from them in exchange, but that we are considering trading off manufacturing sectors in order to sell more agricultural products, it is becoming evident that we are moving more and more toward a colonial relationship with that particular country.

We must all know what the stakes are for the domestic industries—shoes, clothing, textiles:

Eighty-two percent of the footwear market is supplied by foreign products. Only 18 percent of the U.S. market is supplied by American production.

The U.S. market accepts 60 percent of all foreign apparel and textile production. 60 percent

In the apparel industry, employment is the lowest it has been in 49 years! In textiles, the level of employment matches the record low of 1985.

Import of apparel reached 59 percent of 1989, up from only 30 percent in 1981.

Eighty-seven apparel and textile plants have closed in the first 8 months of this year.

The retailers, the wholesalers, the designer clothes groups have been up front and out front with their lobbying. I find, in all instances, while charging the American manufacturers with having made great profits, they have nimbly side-stepped any comment on the profits rolled up in their businesses!

I shop and I talk with many other people who shop. And there are some real questions that need to be asked about the so-called imported bargains we are being offered. Why is it that items made in Third World countries are as expensive as items manufactured in America?

How can it be that a dress—this season—made out of heavy gauze-like material from India costs \$100? I remember 2 or 3 years ago huerachas from India were priced at \$60 per pair. Remember the cut leather beach shoes of 20 years ago at \$1 or \$2 dollars a pair? The very same ones, Mr. Speaker. But, now at \$60 a pair?

And there were the sandals—which I picked up to look at. Attractive, so flimsy that I wondered if they would stand up through a Washington rainstorm. On the sole, the price \$129 per pair, marked "made in Argentina," for a popular designer.

Take any catalog. Check it out for yourself. Imported products from abroad cost as much as products made in this country, time after time!

I am going to read some examples from the latest Sears Roebuck catalog.

Here is a blazer of bright colors to accent your basic black; made in U.S.A. or imported, same identical price of \$55.

Here is a skirt, straight skirt with quality dress-maker details, machine wash, made in U.S.A. or imported, same identical price of \$26.

Here are some knit, polyester jogging suits, weekender jogging suits, made in U.S.A. or imported, the catalog says, same price.

Here are some ladies cotton twill pants, made in U.S.A. and imported, U.S.A. material it says, same price, for a misses it's \$18.49 and for women it's \$20.49 a pair.

Another item, again sports pants, made in the U.S.A. or imported of machine washable cotton and dacron polyester, misses, same price, \$16.79 a pair and women's \$18.79 a pair.

It goes on and on. Let me get to the suits. Here is another blazer for a woman, made in U.S.A. or imported, U.S.A. material. Sometimes they take the material overseas and sew it together and bring it back. This is the same price for misses, \$34.94 and for women \$39.94 and for tall women, \$36.94, same, identical for domestic or for imported goods.

And so on and so on throughout the catalog. All of these markings here are on pages in this catalog which show that the same price exists for made-in-the-U.S.A. or imported material.

□ 1620

Savings on imports? For whom? Passed through or kept? Rather than talking bargains, we should be talking possibly an excess profits tax on importers who charge whatever the market will bear.

On the question of import costs, the flat retailer answer that tariffs raise the price, thereby making the import item as expensive as a domestically produced one, is absolutely absurd. Tariff rates are different for different categories, but in the shopping that most women do, blouses and dresses on average, the tariff is 10 percent. So if a blouse or a dress costs somewhere from \$2 to \$3 to \$10 in Bangladesh, India, the American importer will be paying \$0.20 to \$0.30 to a dollar for each item in tariff costs. Hardly an excuse for the sometimes 300- to 400-percent markup to bring the item up to U.S. market levels.

I have in my pocket some sales slips from some blouses at a local company. All of these were made in Thailand. They are cotton. These prices run from \$40 to \$50 for each, and I would like to bet that in Thailand that blouse can be bought for no more than \$10 each. We are talking about the kind of people who are involved in the manufacture of those blouses and those dresses over there.

Why are we not dealing with the true motives behind all of this?

Read the propaganda surrounding this legislation and you would believe that the retailers of this country are running a public service operation for America. That their major concern is the availability of cheap products.

I urge every man in this House to go shopping and tell me—knowing the economies of many of the countries these articles are coming from—that the profits are not, in many cases, unconscionable.

And, as to the matter of conscience, the proposition put forth by some of the antitextile lobby that Americans have every right to enjoy the fruits of every exploited labor force around the world is absolutely shocking!

From the slave labor of China all the way through India where women and children work in the most appalling conditions, the idea that these poor people should be working to satisfy our jaded demands for instant gratification is sickening.

And, if any free trader tells me that our American workers should compete with this type of labor, then I think he or she marches to a very different tune from the mass of Americans.

As to competition, inside this country where the playing field is level, there are 600 American manufacturers and 25,000 apparel businesses. These companies compete for an ever decreasing market share in America, but beyond that, they are competing every day in one of the most hostile business environments this country has ever experienced. Unlike their foreign competitors, many of whom are subsidized by their governments and totally protected by their governments from imports either by tariffs, some as high as 100 percent of the value, or by quotas, American companies have to fight to even borrow money from the commercial banks at reasonable rates if they can find it, orders in hand. How dare any ivory-tower economist or bureaucrat preach to a bunch of American manufacturers about the joys of competition?

Just a monthly check of U.S. bankruptcies will explain what an economic jungle we have created for our domestic companies. They do not need to take on additional battles with the products of socialist countries or cartel-dominated foreign industries.

This vote, I predict, will be a litmus test for each one of us standing for reelection this year, because the issue is so clear cut. Two million American jobs are on the line, representing, on average, two or three times as many people considering family members. And this is the recognizable loss.

No one is addressing the multiplier effect on the communities impacting the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker. And, contrary to

most reports that this is a southern issue, there are more textile jobs in the State of Pennsylvania than there are steel industry jobs.

Surprising, isn't it?

My home State of Maryland once was a center of clothing manufacture. All the way from the center of Baltimore down toward the Eastern Shore and up through Hagerstown to the Pennsylvania line. These were the steady jobs in the small cities and towns. Jobs many times for the single provider, all too frequently, women.

Sadly most of these jobs have disappeared under the flood of earlier imports. And, many of the mills are shuttered, the villages quiet in the middle of the day, and the workers are carpooling 50 to 100 miles a day, if they are lucky, to jobs in the cities, and the numbers of latchkey children grow apace.

I am getting so impatient with the threats to this Congress that our trading partners will be angry, that they will retaliate. If we are in any kind of confrontation on closing market access, look at the facts. It is an empty threat. How can they close markets which have never been open? How many more empty promises will we accept?

Just last week, the Japanese announced that upon testing American rice they find it unsuitable for the Japanese market. Remember the Japanese snow which was unsuitable for American skis?

How many times are we going to be suckered by the most outrageous defenses of totally protectionist countries?

And, the threat to GATT; would our erstwhile allies, the Germans and the Japanese dare—after their timidity on the Iraq issue—dare to question the need to supply our own requirements at a time of danger? Overlooked by many in this debate is the strategic value of much of our textile capability to the defense of this country.

I am enclosing a partial list of some of the uses of textiles and textile technologies in weapons systems and the types of clothing still being produced in this country being used by our forces right now. The list reads as follows:

TEXTILE AND APPAREL USES IN DEFENSE

Chemical and Biological Protective Suits and Masks.
Hospital Supplies: Gauze, Bandages, Disposables, Organ Implants.
Duffel Bags.
Load Carrying Equipment.
Electrical Insulation.
Rope and Netting.
Cord.
Cotton Blend Combat Camouflage Fabric.
Cotton Blend Combat Camouflage Coats and Trousers.
Dress and Utility Work Trousers, Slacks, Skirts, Shirts, and Blouses.
Cotton Blend Dress Shirting Fabric.
Cotton and Cotton Blend Duck Fabric.
Coveralls and Parkas.

Dress Coats and Utility Jackets.
Woven and Knitted Hats, Caps, Berets, and Hoods.
Gloves/Mittens.
Raincoats and Ponchos.
Liners for Trousers/Coats.
Socks and Handkerchiefs.
Undershirts and Drawers.
Sheets and Blankets.
Towels.
Ticking.
Curtains/Draperies and Carpets.
Shoe Laces.
Sewing Thread.

OTHER DEFENSE/INDUSTRIAL APPLICATIONS

1. RAM—Air-Decelerator—USA (coated Kevlar—200 d.) (grenade decelerators) (helicopter use).
2. Ballute—USAF (420 & 210 d. nylon) (bomb decelerators).
3. Armor Vest & Helmet—Kevlar (1500 d.).
4. Nomex—38/2 Coverall—Sage Green—USAF, USN, Fliers; Olive—tank uniforma.
5. Nomex & Kevlar combination—inside liner—flight jacket—all Services.
6. Ballistic nylon—helmet liner, armor vest outershell, 9MM pistol holster & belt—USA & USMC.
7. Filament Nomex twill (250 d.)—flight suit—USN.
8. 420 d. Nylon pack cloth and backpack—USA.
9. Fuel Cells—rubberized (storage, transport, crashworthy) Helicopters, airplanes, army truck transport.
10. Rayon—carbonizing—shuttle rocket motor, C-4, Trident, D-5, Pershing missiles, re-entry, and propulsion systems.
11. Cordura for duffel bags—USA & USMC.
12. Wet weather gear USN—210 d. nylon.
13. Nylon—1260/840 ammunition pouch & gun cover (150M yds./yr.)—USA.
14. 840 d. Parachute—cargo chutes, drag chutes—USA, USMC.
15. Scrim—tank camouflage netting (Brunswick)—USA.
16. Scrim—protective covers (for lamination) for general purposes (400M yds./year)—All Services.
17. 40753 Flag—(200M yds./yr.)—USN signal flags.
18. V-Belt covers—All truck transport & tanks.
19. Truck tire components—truck transport.
20. Tarpaulin waterproof fabrics—all services.
21. Textile Composite Applications (glass, carbon fiber, Kevlar).
Helicopter blades and fuselages (Army "Blackhawk" and "Cobra" helicopters).
Combat vehicle and shipboard armor (Army rough terrain combat "Hummer" and "Humvee" vehicles).
Missile casings, launch tubes, and propulsion systems (MX, Minuteman, Trident submarine missiles).
Computer/Avionic circuit boards.
Airplane brake systems and engines.
Space Shuttle (booster rocket recovery nylon parachutes and "Nomex" felt covering under "belly" ceramic tiles).

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that one thing Members did not hear me read was boots for our military, because we are buying most of our boots overseas now.

The father of a marine who has gone over there said that his son wrote to him and said, "Dad, see what you

can do about getting us a better-quality boot."

I also might point out, and I think this is something that my colleagues should remember, that those people who work in the boot factories overseas, whether it is in Korea, whether it is in Taiwan, whether it is in Japan, or wherever it is, that those people working in those boot factories do not pay any taxes to help keep the Pentagon going, but those who work in the industry in the United States of America do pay taxes and help against the deficit of this country.

I also might point out that when a dollar is spent in the United States by a Federal agency that 42 cents of that dollar, of every dollar, goes into some sort of tax in the United States, whether it is local tax, State tax, unemployment, Social Security, the IRS, what have you.

□ 1630

That helps to curtail, to cut down the deficit, and helps to keep the Pentagon and other Federal agencies going. That is something that we cannot emphasize enough.

It is absolutely confounding to me that we have come to such a time in the history of this great Nation that there would be any question as to whether we would defend—yes, the proper word here is defend—American jobs, American industries, American communities.

We have spent over \$1 trillion for defense in the last decade. Our troops, our men and women, are sitting in a hostile desert defending Saudi Arabia and trying to free Kuwait. What is the purpose of defense overall if it is not to defend America and our way of life?

The textile vote tomorrow will focus on what our oath of office demands that we defend. I predict, the response to this vote, can signal to the world—once and for all—just what the American people want their Government to defend—decent jobs—stable, prosperous communities—and an opportunity for Americans to aspire to a better life for them and their children.

More prosperity in Third World countries does not address any of these hopes. Happy trading partners carry not whit of responsibility for this country. Besides, they are easy to please—just one more time.

First they demanded our television industry. Then industrial fasteners and machine tools were desired. Then automobiles and, in the last 10 years, microelectronics. And they took our markets and they smiled and, every year, they demand more.

And, what have we gotten? A rising debt, falling treasury receipts, a falling dollar, a banking system at major risk, the savings and loan industry devastated, and that great hope of all the service sector economists, McDonald's,

has had a perfectly disappointing year.

Speaking of empty promises, don't you remember how our heavy industrial base was to be replaced by high technology? And then, when high technology began to falter before the impact of imports, well sir, we were just all going to work in the service economy. Banks and brokerage houses, real estate and services.

Services to whom? Doing what?

How sad it all is. How much we have all lost. But these jobs, these industries can still be saved.

Let's do it. Let us tell our allies to stop the threats. Let's demand reciprocity—fair trade. We can save a whole lot of money by dismantling all of our customs' bureaucracy and just give the officers at the ports the laws of every trading country. The officers will be free to allow whichever item into this country that is allowed to enter into the exporting country. Reciprocity. Seems fair to me.

Too simplistic, by far, I know. But, it should be the underlying principal of every trade act passed by this country.

The watershed battle for our people is not going to take place half the world away from America in the Middle East. It will take place on this floor next week. Vote yes on the Textile, Shoe, Apparel Act of 1990. Vote to defend America and American jobs.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the Chair declares the House in recess until 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 5 p.m.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HOYER] at 5 p.m.

FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 3033, on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 3033, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 0, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

YEAS—368

Ackerman	Edwards (CA)	Leach (IA)
Alexander	Edwards (OK)	Lehman (FL)
Andrews	Emerson	Lent
Anunzio	Engel	Levin (MI)
Anthony	English	Levine (CA)
Archer	Erdreich	Lewis (FL)
Armey	Evans	Lewis (GA)
Aspin	Fawell	Lightfoot
Atkins	Fazio	Lipinski
Baker	Feighan	Livingston
Ballenger	Fields	Lloyd
Barnard	Fish	Long
Bartlett	Flippo	Lowery (CA)
Barton	Ford (MI)	Luken, Thomas
Bateman	Ford (TN)	Lukens, Donald
Bellenson	Frank	Machtley
Bennett	Frost	Madigan
Bentley	Galegally	Markey
Bereuter	Gallo	Marlenee
Berman	Gaydos	Martin (NY)
Bevill	Gejdenson	Martinez
Bilbray	Gekas	Mavroules
Bliley	Geren	Mazzoli
Boehlert	Gibbons	McCandless
Boggs	Gillmor	McCloskey
Bonior	Gilman	McCollum
Borski	Gingrich	McCrery
Bosco	Glickman	McCurdy
Brennan	Gonzalez	McDermott
Brooks	Goodling	McEwen
Broomfield	Gordon	McGrath
Browder	Goss	McHugh
Brown (CO)	Grandy	McMillan (NC)
Bruce	Grant	McMillen (MD)
Bryant	Green	McNulty
Buechner	Guarini	Meyers
Bunning	Gunderson	Mfume
Burton	Hall (OH)	Michel
Byron	Hall (TX)	Miller (OH)
Callahan	Hamilton	Miller (WA)
Campbell (CO)	Hammerschmidt	Mineta
Cardin	Hancock	Moakley
Carper	Hansen	Molinar
Carr	Harris	Mollohan
Chandler	Hastert	Montgomery
Chapman	Hatcher	Moody
Clarke	Hawkins	Moorhead
Clay	Hayes (IL)	Morella
Clement	Hayes (LA)	Morrison (WA)
Clinger	Hefley	Mrazek
Coble	Hefner	Murphy
Coleman (MO)	Henry	Murtha
Coleman (TX)	Henger	Myers
Collins	Hertel	Nagle
Combest	Hiler	Natcher
Condit	Hoagland	Neal (NC)
Conte	Hochbrueckner	Nelson
Conyers	Holloway	Nielson
Costello	Hopkins	Nowak
Coughlin	Horton	Oakar
Courter	Hoyer	Oberstar
Craig	Hubbard	Obey
Crane	Huckaby	Olin
Dannemeyer	Hughes	Ortiz
Darden	Hunter	Owens (NY)
Davis	Hyde	Oxley
de la Garza	Inhofe	Packard
DeFazio	Ireland	Pallone
DeLay	James	Parker
Dellums	Jenkins	Parris
Derrick	Johnson (SD)	Pashayan
DeWine	Johnston	Patterson
Dickinson	Jones (GA)	Paxon
Dicks	Jones (NC)	Payne (NJ)
Dingell	Jontz	Payne (VA)
Dixon	Kanjorski	Pease
Dorgan (ND)	Kaptur	Penny
Dornan (CA)	Kasich	Perkins
Douglas	Kastenmeier	Pickett
Downey	Kennelly	Pickle
Dreier	Kildee	Porter
Duncan	Kolbe	Poshard
Durbin	Kyl	Price
Dwyer	LaFalce	Pursell
Dymally	Lagomarsino	Quillen
Dyson	Lancaster	Rahall
Early	Lantos	Rangel
Eckart	Laughlin	Ravenel

Ray	Sikorski	Synar
Regula	Slisisky	Tallon
Rhodes	Skaggs	Tauzin
Richardson	Skeen	Taylor
Ridge	Skelton	Thomas (CA)
Rinaldo	Slattery	Thomas (GA)
Ritter	Slaughter (NY)	Thomas (WY)
Roberts	Slaughter (VA)	Torres
Robinson	Smith (FL)	Torricelli
Roe	Smith (IA)	Towns
Rogers	Smith (NE)	Trafficant
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Traxler
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Udall
Rostenkowski	Smith (VT)	Unsoeld
Roth	Smith, Denny	Upton
Roukema	(OR)	Valentine
Rowland (GA)	Smith, Robert	Vander Jagt
Russo	(NH)	Vento
Saiki	Smith, Robert	Volkmer
Sarpalius	(OR)	Vucanovich
Savage	Snowe	Walgren
Sawyer	Solarz	Walker
Saxton	Solomon	Walsh
Schaefer	Spence	Waxman
Scheuer	Spratt	Weiss
Schiff	Staggers	Weldon
Schneider	Stallings	Wheat
Schroeder	Stangeland	Whitten
Schumer	Stark	Wise
Sensenbrenner	Stearns	Wolf
Serrano	Stenholm	Wolpe
Sharp	Stokes	Wyden
Shaw	Studds	Wyllie
Shays	Stump	Yates
Shumway	Sundquist	Yatron
Shuster	Swift	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—64

Anderson	Gray	Pelosi
Applegate	Houghton	Petri
AuCoin	Hutto	Rose
Bates	Jacobs	Rowland (CT)
Bilirakis	Johnson (CT)	Roybal
Boucher	Kennedy	Sabo
Boxer	Klecicka	Sangmeister
Brown (CA)	Kolter	Schuetz
Bustamante	Kostmayer	Schulze
Leath (TX)	Leath (TX)	Tanner
Cooper	Lehman (CA)	Tauke
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Visclosky
Coyne	Lowey (NY)	Washington
Crockett	Manton	Watkins
Donnelly	Martin (IL)	Weber
Espy	Matsui	Whittaker
Fascell	McDade	Williams
Flake	Miller (CA)	Wilson
Foglietta	Morrison (CT)	Young (AK)
Frenzel	Neal (MA)	Young (FL)
Gephardt	Owens (UT)	
Gradison	Panetta	

□ 1732

Mr. SCHEUER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. OXLEY changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 332 on the Senate bill, S. 3033, I was unavoidably detained coming from California.

Had I been present I would have voted yea on free mail for the military serving in the Persian Gulf.

ALLOWING FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Hoyer). Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, September 13, 1990, the unfinished business is the question de novo on the motion to recommit the bill H.R. 5611 with instructions, on which further proceedings were postponed on Thursday, September 13, 1990.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 142, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

AYES—227

Archer	Flippo	Machtley
Army	Gallely	Madigan
Ballenger	Gallo	Marlenee
Barnard	Gaydos	Martin (NY)
Bartlett	Gekas	McCandless
Barton	Geren	McCollum
Bateman	Gillmor	McCrery
Bentley	Gingrich	McEwen
Bereuter	Glickman	McGrath
Bevill	Gooding	McMillan (NC)
Bilbray	Goss	Meyers
Bliley	Grandy	Michel
Boehlert	Grant	Miller (OH)
Brennan	Green	Miller (WA)
Broomfield	Gunderson	Mollinari
Browder	Hall (TX)	Moody
Brown (CO)	Hammerschmidt	Moorhead
Buechner	Hancock	Morella
Bunning	Hansen	Morrison (WA)
Burton	Harris	Nagle
Callahan	Hastert	Natcher
Campbell (CO)	Hayes (LA)	Neal (NC)
Chandler	Hefley	Nelson
Chapman	Hefner	Nielson
Clarke	Henry	Oxley
Clinger	Herger	Packard
Coble	Hiller	Pallone
Coleman (MO)	Holloway	Parker
Combest	Hopkins	Parris
Condit	Horton	Pashayan
Conte	Hubbard	Patterson
Costello	Huckaby	Paxon
Coughlin	Hunter	Payne (VA)
Courter	Hyde	Penny
Craig	Inhofe	Pickett
Crane	Ireland	Pickle
Dannemeyer	James	Porter
Darden	Jenkins	Poshard
Davis	Johnson (SD)	Price
de la Garza	Jones (GA)	Pursell
DeLay	Jontz	Quillen
Derrick	Kanjorski	Rahall
DeWine	Kasich	Ravenel
Dickinson	Kildee	Ray
Dornan (CA)	Kolbe	Regula
Douglas	Kyl	Rhodes
Dreier	Lagomarsino	Ridge
Duncan	Lancaster	Rinaldo
Dwyer	Laughlin	Ritter
Early	Leach (IA)	Roberts
Eckart	Lent	Robinson
Edwards (OK)	Lewis (FL)	Roe
Emerson	Lightfoot	Rogers
English	Lloyd	Rohrabacher
Erdreich	Long	Ros-Lehtinen
Fawell	Lowery (CA)	Roth
Fields	Lukens, Donald	Roukema

Rowland (GA)
Saiki
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schneider
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shumway
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (VT)
Smith, Denny
(OR)
Smith, Robert
(NH)
Smith, Robert
(OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Tallion

Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Traficant
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wyllie
Yatron

NOES—142

Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Aspin
Atkins
Baker
Bellenson
Bennett
Berman
Boggs
Bonior
Borski
Bosco
Brooks
Bruce
Bryant
Byron
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Clay
Clement
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conyers
DeFazio
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dymally
Dyson
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Evans
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frost
Gejdenson

Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoyer
Hughes
Johnston
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
LaFalce
Lantos
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Luken, Thomas
Markay
Martinez
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers

Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Payne (NJ)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Rangel
Richardson
Rostenkowski
Russo
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schumer
Serrano
Sikorski
Skaggs
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Taylor
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Unsoeld
Vento
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Yates

NOT VOTING—63

Anderson
Applegate
AuCoin
Bates
Billakis
Boucher
Boxer
Brown (CA)
Bustamante
Campbell (CA)
Cooper
Cox
Coyne
Crockett
Donnelly
Espy
Fascell
Flake
Foglietta
Frenzel
Gephardt

Gradison
Gray
Houghton
Hutto
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Kennedy
Klecza
Kolter
Kostmayer
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Manton
Martin (IL)
Matsui
McDade
Miller (CA)
Morrison (CT)
Neal (MA)

Owens (UT)
Panetta
Petri
Rose
Rowland (CT)
Roybal
Sabo
Sangmeister
Schuette
Schulze
Tanner
Tauke
Visclosky
Washington
Watkins
Weber
Whittaker
Williams
Wilson
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1752

Mr. FRANK changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. DE LA GARZA, EDWARDS of Oklahoma, NAGLE, BEVILL, and CHAPMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the instructions of the House, and on behalf of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report the bill, H.R. 5611, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Hoyer). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES PARTICIPATING IN TEMPORARY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT IN ARDUOUS CIRCUMSTANCES.

(a) MAILING PRIVILEGES.—In a case in which members of the Armed Forces are temporarily deployed overseas for an operational contingency in arduous circumstances, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, members so deployed shall be provided mailing privileges under section 3401(a)(1)(A) of title 39, United States Code, in the same manner as if the forces deployed were engaged in military operations involving armed conflict with hostile foreign force.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE FROM LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS.—There shall be transferred to the Postal Service as postal revenues, out of appropriations made for the legislative branch for the purpose of franked mailings, as a necessary expense of the appropriations concerned, the equivalent amount for postage due, as determined by the Postal Service, for matter sent in the mails under authority of subsection (a).

(c) EXPIRATION.—The provisions of this section shall expire on June 30, 1991.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on H.R. 5611, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall No. 332 and rollcall No. 333. Had I been here, I would have cast the following votes: "aye" and "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I was detained in my district during rollcall votes 332 and 333. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 332, and "aye" on rollcall 333.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on business in my district. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows on the listed rollcall votes:

Rollcall No. 332, "aye," Rollcall No. 333, "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I was participating in the budget summit negotiations at Andrews Air Force Base and was unable to cast my vote during House proceedings. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

Rollcall No. 332—"yea," on flee mail for military personnel serving in the Persian Gulf region. Rollcall No. 333—"no," on a motion to recommit the bill H.R. 5611 with instructions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district and was unable to vote on rollcalls 332 and 333. Had I been present, I would have voted "Aye" on both.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 580, STUDENT ATHLETE RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 580) to require institutions of higher education receiving Federal financial assistance to provide certain information with respect to the graduation rates of student-athletes at such institutions, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HAWKINS, FORD of Michigan, WILLIAMS, OWENS of New York, PERKINS, GOODLING, COLEMAN of Missouri, and HENRY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2666, MILDRED AND CLAUDE PEPPER SCHOLARSHIP ACT.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2666) to establish a Mildred and Claude Pepper Scholarship Program, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none, and without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HAWKINS, FORD of Michigan, WILLIAMS, GOODLING, and COLEMAN of Missouri.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2104, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1990

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 449, I move to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2104) to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore and strengthen civil rights laws that ban discrimination in employment, and for other purposes with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

□ 1800

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOYER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: From the Committee on Education and Labor: Messrs. HAWKINS, MARTINEZ, WILLIAMS, WASHINGTON, FUSTER, MFUME, GOODLING, GUNDERSON, FAWELL, and GRANDY.

From the Committee on the Judiciary: Messrs. BROOKS, EDWARDS of California, KASTENMEIER, CONYERS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Messrs. CROCKETT, FISH, MOORHEAD, HYDE, and SENSENBRENNER.

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF HON. STENY H. HOYER TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL ON SEPTEMBER 17, 1990

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 14, 1990.

I hereby designate the Honorable STENY H. HOYER to act as Speaker pro tempore to

sign the enrolled bill S. 3033 on September 17, 1990.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is accepted.

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2798

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2798.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO SIT TOMORROW, SEPTEMBER 18, 1990, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to meet during the 5-minute rule tomorrow, September 18, 1990.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL JOB SKILLS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 333) to designate the week of September 30, 1990, through October 6, 1990, as "National Job Skills Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so simply to acknowledge the work of the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] who is the chief sponsor of this joint resolution.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 333

Whereas the ability to maintain an internationally competitive and productive economy and a high standard of living depends on the development and utilization of new technologies;

Whereas new technologies require skills that are currently unavailable in the national workforce;

Whereas experts in both the public and private sectors predict that a shortage of skilled entry-level workers will exist through the remainder of the twentieth century;

Whereas young people in the United States are experiencing higher than normal unemployment rates due to the lack of skills necessary to perform entry-level jobs that are currently available;

Whereas young people in the United States will continue to experience higher than normal unemployment rates unless such young people develop the skills necessary to perform the entry-level jobs that become available;

Whereas workers in the United States, threatened by dislocation due to plant closures and industrial relocation, need special training and education to prepare for new jobs and new opportunities; and

Whereas a National Job Skills Week would serve to focus attention on present and future workforce needs, to encourage public and private cooperation in job training and educational efforts, and highlight the technological changes underway in the workplace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of September 30, 1990, through October 6, 1990, is designated as "National Job Skills Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 331) to designate the week of September 23 through 29, 1990, as "Religious Freedom Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY], the chief sponsor of this joint resolution.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are a lucky Nation. Our Founding Fathers gave us one of the most precious gifts any people ever received—religious freedom.

Hopefully, today Members of this body will pass my resolution, House Joint Resolution 638 designating the week of September 23, 1990, as "Religious Freedom Week."

This year marks the 200th anniversary of George Washington's immortal words addressed to our ancestors, "To bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance." Written in a historic letter to the Tauro synagogue in New Port, RI.

What a wonderful promise for the future of America. These words brought hope to all citizens that they were truly free to worship without fear of tyranny of a state religion. That was the promise by the new President.

It is difficult for us as Americans today to realize just how much that meant to those people at that time.

House Joint Resolution 638 crosses political and ideological boundaries. Religious freedom is the basic American right of every citizen of every age, country of origin, religion, moral or ethical belief—whether a member of a religious institution or not. It is this right that we celebrate to honor and protect.

Half the world is denied the right to exercise religious convictions freely. For them, the gift which we take so casually is only a hope, a goal to be attained. Those who live in slave states need no reminder of the precious nature of the right to worship freely in accord with the dictates of one's conscience.

Occasionally, we need to remind ourselves and the Nation what a great blessing it is to be free of government interference in worshipping as we choose or in choosing not to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Members for supporting resolution in the past 2 years, and hope they will continue their support now and in the future to preserve American religious liberty, drawing courage and strength from its heritage.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 331

Whereas the principle of religious liberty was an essential part of the founding of the Nation, and must be safeguard with internal vigilance by all men and women of goodwill;

Whereas religious liberty has been endangered throughout history by bigotry and indifference;

Whereas the first amendment to the Constitution guarantees the inalienable rights of individuals to worship freely or not be religious, as they choose, without interference from governmental or other agencies;

Whereas the Constitution ensures religious freedom to all of the people of the United States;

Whereas at Touro Synagogue in 1790, President George Washington issued his famous letter declaring "to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance";

Whereas the Touro Synagogue letter advocating the doctrine of mutual respect and understanding was issued more than 1 year before the adoption of the Bill of Rights;

Whereas the letter of President Washington and the Touro Synagogue have become national symbols of the commitment of the United States to religious freedom;

Whereas throughout the history of the Nation, religion has contributed to the welfare of believers and of society generally, and has been a force for maintaining high standards for morality, ethics, and justice;

Whereas religion is most free when it is observed voluntarily at private initiative, uncontaminated by Government interference and unconstrained by majority preference; and

Whereas religious liberty can be protected only through the efforts of all persons of goodwill in a united commitment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) the week of September 23 through 29, 1990, is designated as "Religious Freedom Week"; and

(2) the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States, including members of all faiths or none, to join together in support of religious tolerance and religious liberty for all, and to observe the week with appropriate activities

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 313) designating October 3, 1990, as "National Teacher Appreciation Day," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the rights to object, I do so to yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], the chief sponsor of this joint resolution.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to rise as the sponsor of National Teacher Appreciation Day.

My legislation designates October 3, 1990, as National Teacher Appreciation Day. Two hundred and twenty-one Members of the House, including one hundred and sixty-six original co-

sponsors, joined me in support of this day of recognition.

I'd like to express my appreciation to Chairman SAWYER and Vice Chairman RIDGE of the Subcommittee on Census and Population for their immediate attention to this measure.

Also I thank Chairman WILLIAM FORD and Vice Chairman BEN GILMAN of the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for expediting action on this measure.

There are over 3½ million teachers in the United States at all levels. I commend them for the job they do in the forefront of our educational system. It is in their dedication and devotion to our children's education that America places its hopes for the future.

The best advice I've ever received during my tenure in the House of Representatives came from a teacher.

He told me that a person is smart if they learn something good every day, perfect if they never make mistakes knowingly, content if they take action to make things happen and happy by choosing to be happy.

Those words, from the much-respected Jhoon Rhee, have been an inspiration to me and many of my friends and colleagues. Likewise, America's teachers provide inspiration for our children.

It's easy for some in Washington to think of education as a line-item in the budget. But the efforts of our teachers are more than that, especially in areas where hardships are most severe.

Not all children receive the attention they deserve outside of school. Not every child gets to play with friends in the park. Not every child gets a headstart on learning or an early jump on education.

And some children need the additional guidance that teachers provide in order to make the right decisions in difficult situations.

It is when conditions are at their worst and the problem difficult that America's teachers shine the brightest. Our teachers not only educate on the subjects of algebra and English, but on the broader need to become responsible and productive members of the community.

Teachers often do not receive the accolades for the important work they do. Their reward many times is knowing that they have made a great contribution to another human being. Their reward is found in seeing a student reach his or her goal.

That's why it is with great admiration for the job our teachers perform and for the responsibility they hold that I urge the passage of this legislation commemorating America's teachers.

□ 1810

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], my friend and chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, who, I believe, is a former teacher himself.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak today, but I wanted to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], our colleague, and to thank him for his effort to bring this measure before us. I particularly want to thank him for mentioning the inspiration which teachers are to young people in classrooms today. That inspiration extends to virtually the entire panoply of professions to which they might aspire, but perhaps none is more important than that profession which we honor today.

At a time when this Nation is relying more on its teachers than perhaps any time in the last century, it is important to understand that we are not replacing those teachers who in that current cadre of profession and are leaving the profession faster than our colleges are able to produce their successors. Perhaps the single most important task that a teacher today can undertake for himself or herself, and perhaps there is no more important undertaking, than to recognize at the beginning of each day that perhaps the most important thing a teacher can do is to inspire at least one child in their classroom to aspire to replace that teacher in that profession.

Mr. Speaker, there is no higher honor, there is no more honored profession in the United States, than that of teaching, and in recognizing this very special day we give special emphasis to that, and I appreciate this effort to do so.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOYER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 313

Whereas education of the Nation's youth is the foundation of the Nation's future;

Whereas education is a lifelong process which is beneficial to the individual and thus beneficial to the entire Nation;

Whereas teachers deserve credit for their invaluable role in providing education;

Whereas teaching not only involves traditional areas of education, but today also includes vocational education, continuing education, and education for special needs;

Whereas teachers contribute not only to the academic growth of students, but also to their ethical, social, and emotional development;

Whereas a student's respect for his or her teacher is essential to the student's ability to learn; and

Whereas the contributions of teachers should be celebrated often in order to honor the role of teachers in society and to affirm and foster respect for teachers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 3, 1990, is designated as "National Teacher Appreciation Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTRY MUSIC MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 603) to designate the month of October 1990 as "Country Music Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only to acknowledge the work of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT], who is the chief sponsor of this joint resolution.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the month of October as Country Music Month.

Country music is uniquely American and reflects our Nation's history, growth, and culture. I am indeed proud to represent Nashville, TN—Music City U.S.A., the home of country music.

This October marks the 26th annual observance of "Country Music Month." Two hundred and thirty-six of my colleagues have joined me in sponsoring House Joint Resolution 603 asking President Bush to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe this special month.

As an industry, country music contributes \$550 million annually to our Nation's economy. According to a recent Harris survey, country music is the best-liked music in America, with over 60 percent of adult Americans stating that country is their favorite music. And, country music has gained international appeal, spreading across our world.

From the Soviet Union to Australia, people love country music. No matter where I travel, people always know about my home city, Nashville, TN, because of its identification with the country music industry.

Country is a musical style born in the hills of Tennessee, Virginia, and the Carolinas. It draws its roots from religious hymns, traditional ballads, folk songs, and even the soulful strains of rhythm and blues.

There are thousands of country music songs whose lyrics I could recite today to illustrate how country music embodies the spirit of America. I chose the Country Music Association's 1985 Song of the Year, written by my friend, Lee Greenwood.

The song is called "God Bless the U.S.A." Let me explain why I chose this particular song.

For the first time in more than a decade, a vast mobilization of American troops to foreign soil is under way. Our sons, daughters, husbands, and wives are stationed in a faraway Arab desertland, poised to protect the ideals for which America stands.

Since the outbreak of the crisis in the Persian Gulf, I have thought of this song many times. It contains a stirring patriotic message that has become more appropriate than ever.

As our friends and loved ones suffer in the oppressive heat in Saudi Arabia, willing to sacrifice their lives to defend our proud Nation, the words to this song ring very true.

So, with Lee Greenwood's permission and the support of the Country Music Association and the entire country music industry, I would like to dedicate the words to "God Bless the U.S.A.," and the 26th anniversary of Country Music Month to our troops in the Middle East.

GOD BLESS THE U.S.A.

If tomorrow all the things were gone
I'd worked for all my life
And I had to start again
With just my children and my wife
I'd thank my lucky stars
To be livin' here today
'Cause the flag still stands for freedom
And they can't take that away
From the lakes of Minnesota
To the hills of Tennessee
Across the plains of Texas
From sea to shining sea
From Detroit down to Houston
And New York to LA
There's pride in every American Heart
And it's time to stand and say . . .
I'm proud to be an American
Where at least I know I'm free
And I won't forget the men who died
Who gave that right to me.
And I'd gladly stand up next to you
And defend her still today
'Cause there ain't no doubt I love this land
God bless the U.S.A.

I ask my colleagues to join me, the country music industry, and the millions of country music fans throughout the world in recognizing the 26th anniversary of Country Music Month and in dedicating this year's Country Music Month observance to our troops in the Middle East.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H. J. RES. 603

Whereas country music derives its roots from the folk songs of our Nation's workers, captures the spirit of our religious hymns, reflects the sorrow and joy of our traditional ballads, and echoes the drive and soulfulness of rhythm and blues;

Whereas country music has played an integral part in our Nation's history, accompanying the growth of the Nation and reflecting the ethnic and cultural diversity of our people;

Whereas country music embodies a spirit of America and the deep and genuine feelings individuals experience throughout their lives;

Whereas the distinctively American refrains of country music have been performed for audiences throughout the world, striking a chord deep within the hearts and souls of its fans; and

Whereas October 1990 marks the twenty-sixth annual observance of Country Music Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of October 1990 is designated as "Country Music Month", and that the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the several joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CAUCUS FOR SOUND SPENDING AND TAX POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, right now the budget summitters are continuing to meet out at Andrews Air Force Base about the budget crisis that faces this body and the Nation, and they are still talking about putting a litany of taxes, additional taxes, on the backs of the American people.

When we first found out that the President was starting to relent on his commitment that there would be no new taxes considered, a number of us became involved in a new caucus here in the Congress called the Caucus for Sound Spending and Tax Policy, and that caucus, working with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Heritage Foundation and other leading think tanks, came up with a budget proposal that will meet the targets, the required targets, this year without a tax increase.

I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker. We came up with a budget that was sent to all 535 Members of Congress and the President, plus the budget

summiters, that will meet the targets without a tax increase levied on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, if the summiters did not like our budget proposal, in addition we gave them \$31 billion in substitutes, for which they could change our budget to meet their concerns.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if they did not like what we had in our budget, we gave them \$31 billion in alternatives.

We do not need a tax increase, Mr. Speaker, and today in the Indianapolis Star there was an editorial that alluded to a program or a budget proposal from the Heritage Foundation in addition to the one that we proposed, and I would like to read that for my colleagues and for anyone else who may be paying attention. The title of the article is "Revitalize."

It says,

For the past two years, the economy has been running in lead boots. The Heritage Foundation has a multi-faceted plan to remove them.

It has proposed action to avert a recession and spur economic growth. It called for a 4 percent limit on annual federal spending increases and a Social Security tax cut that would be realized immediately in workers' paychecks.

The foundation's Economic Growth Package also recommended taking tax increases "off the table"; cutting the capital gains tax to 15 percent; clearing the tax code of barriers to savings and investment; and lightening the regulatory burden on business.

These actions, said Daniel Mitchell, John M. Olin senior fellow in political economy, "would produce a balanced federal budget by 1997 with no new taxes or cuts in any programs."

Now think about that, Mr. Speaker. We can increase spending for all these programs by 4 percent and still reach a balanced budget by 1997. The problem is my colleagues that are out there at that budget summit want to increase spending way beyond that 4-percent level. We cannot increase spending 4 percent a year for all these programs and still give in to capital gains tax cuts which would increase jobs in this country and reach the balanced budget that we all want by 1997. We do not need a tax increase.

They went on to say, "If Congress sticks to the 4-percent increase limit, the Federal budget will be balanced by the end of fiscal year 1996 and show an \$11 billion surplus in 1997."

□ 1820

Contrary to its faulty "soak the poor" label, the capital gains tax cut would raise the gross national product by 0.4 of 1 percent annually through 1995, add 2½ million new jobs, and generate an additional \$30 to \$40 billion of new tax revenue during the next 5 years.

Cutting the Social Security payroll tax by 2.2 percent would spur GNP growth by an additional 0.3 of 1 per-

cent by 1993 and create another half a million new jobs.

In addition, they said the record economic growth that began in 1982 is no accident. It is the result of tax cuts, stabilized monetary policy, and reduced Government intervention in the economy. They went on to say the stakes are enormous. The economy is not numbers, it is people. When growth falters, people lose their jobs. When the stock market falls, millions of people's pensions lose their value. More than any group, it is the poor who suffer the most. The record job creation of the 1980's disproportionately benefited women, minorities, and the poor. They would be the ones who would bear the brunt of a recession.

Mr. Speaker, if we increase taxes now, make no mistake about it, it will precipitate a major recession in this country. We do not need a tax increase, Mr. Speaker; we need to cut spending. That, coupled with the 4 percent growth that the Heritage Foundation is talking about, 4-percent increases in spending each and every year for the next 5 years, would still reach a balanced budget by 1997.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the American people and Members are hearing what I am saying tonight. There is no question in my mind or any person's mind who has looked at this problem: we can reach a balanced budget by 1997, and still increase spending each year by 4 percent, without a tax increase. A tax increase, Mr. Speaker, would precipitate a major economic downturn and a recession.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article referred to for the RECORD.

The article in its entirety is as follows:

For the past two years, the economy has been running in lead boots. The Heritage Foundation has a multi-faceted plan to remove them.

It has proposed action to avert a recession and spur economic growth. It called for a 4 percent limit on annual federal spending increases and a Social Security tax cut that would be realized immediately in workers' paychecks.

The foundation's Economic Growth Package also recommended taking tax increases "off the table"; cutting the capital gains tax to 15 percent; clearing the tax code of barriers to savings and investment; and lightening the regulatory burden on business.

These actions, said Daniel Mitchell, John M. Olin senior fellow in political economy, "would produce a balanced federal budget by 1997 with no new taxes or cuts in any programs."

If Congress sticks to the 4 percent increase limit, said Scott Hodge, a student of federal budgetary affairs, "the federal budget will be balanced by the end of fiscal 1996 and show an \$11 billion surplus the following fiscal year."

Contrary to its faulty "soak the poor" label, the capital gains tax cut "would raise the gross national product by 0.4 percent annually through 1995, add 2.5 million new jobs and generate an additional \$30 billion to \$40 billion of new tax revenue during the

next five years," said Allen Sinai, chief economist for the Boston Company.

Cutting the Social Security payroll tax by 2.2 percent "would spur GNP growth by an additional 0.3 percent by 1993 and create 500,000 new jobs," according to Fiscal Associates Inc., a Washington-based consulting firm.

Action on the other recommendations in the package, mentioned above, would clear barriers from the economic road.

"The record economic growth that began in 1982 is no accident. It is the result of tax cuts, stabilized monetary policy and reduced government intervention in the economy," says Mitchell.

"The stakes are enormous. The economy is not numbers, it is people. When growth falters, people lose their jobs. When the stock market falls, millions of people's pensions lose their value," he pointed out. "More than any other group, it is the poor who suffer most. The record job creation of the 1980s disproportionately benefited women, minorities and the poor. They would be the ones who would bear the brunt of a recession."

The kind of economic vitamins being recommended by the Heritage Foundation worked before, as the experience of the 1980s proved. The president and Congress should revitalize the economy with them now and get the expansion going again.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McDADE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BILIRAKIS (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and September 18 and 19, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. MATSUI (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYES of Illinois) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY for 5 minutes, on September 18.

Mr. OBEY for 60 minutes each day, on September 19 and 21.

Mr. McCURDY for 60 minutes each day, on September 25, 26, 27, and October 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, and 18.

Mr. PICKLE for 5 minutes each day, on September 19, 20, 25, 26, 27, and October 2, 3, and 4.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana for 5 minutes, today and on September 18, and for 60 minutes each day, on October 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SAWYER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MILLER of California for 60 minutes, on October 1.

Mr. OWENS of New York for 60 minutes, each day on September 24, 25, 26 and 27, and on October 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. SCHNEIDER.

Mr. MARLENEE.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. ROTH in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYES of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDERSON, in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ, in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California, in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, in six instances.

Mr. BRUCE.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. HERTEL, in two instances.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE, in two instances.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

Mr. SOLARZ, in two instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2088. An act to extend titles I and II of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3033. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow free mailing privileges to be extended to members of the Armed Forces while engaged in temporary military operations under arduous circumstances.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 14, 1990:

H.R. 94. An act to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to allow for the development and issuance of guidelines concerning the use and installation of automatic sprinkler systems and smoke detectors in places of public accommodation affecting commerce, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7. An act to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act to improve the provision of services under such Act and to extend the authorities contained in such Act through the fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 18, 1990, at 10 a.m.).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3884. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for dire emergency appropriations for fiscal year 1990 and appropriations transfer language for the Department of Defense—Military; and language that would cancel Egyptian debt for foreign military sales, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 101-237); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3885. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Production and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Strategic and Critical Materials Report during the period April 1989–September 1989, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98-2(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3886. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to El Salvador (Transmittal No. 16-90), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3887. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Germany (Transmittal No. 17-90), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3888. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3889. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a revised report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1989 Through March 31, 1990, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, Section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3890. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on Superconductivity, trans-

mitting the final report of the Commission, pursuant to Public Law 100-418, Section 5142(e)(5) (102 Stat. 1446); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

3891. A letter from the Secretary of Energy transmitting the 11th annual report on the Use of Alcohol in Fuels, pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 4041 nt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3892. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the fourth report on tier III Federal agency drug-free workplace programs, pursuant to Public Law 100-71, Section 503(a)(1)(A) (101 Stat. 468); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1576. A bill to modify the boundary of the Cranberry Wilderness, located in the Monongahela National Forest, WV; with an amendment (Rept. 101-458, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4107. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to permit certain uses of lands within Richmond National Battlefield Park and Colonial National Historical Park in the Commonwealth of Virginia, with amendment 3 (Rept. 101-706). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4309. A bill to establish the Smith River National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 101-707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4660. A bill to authorize the establishment of a memorial at Custer Battlefield National Monument to honor the Indians who fought in the Battle of the Little Bighorn, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 101-708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4687. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the Lower Merced River in California as a compound of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; with an amendment (Rept. 101-709). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4811. A bill to expand the boundaries of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 101-710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4878. A bill to establish the Lake Meredith National Recreation Area in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 101-711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 830. An act to amend

Public Law 99-647, establishing the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission, to authorize the Commission to take immediate action in furtherance of its purposes and to increase the authorization of appropriations for the Commission; with an amendment (Rept. 101-712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2419. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain property in the Chattahoochee National Forest for the construction of facilities in the National Forest; with an amendment (Rept. 101-713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2205. An act to designate certain lands in the State of Maine as wilderness (Rept. 101-714, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X,

H.R. 5264. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5264; H.R. 5264 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. FAUNTROY):

H.R. 5628. A bill to waive the period of congressional review for certain District of Columbia acts authorizing the issuance of District of Columbia revenue bonds; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 5629. A bill to provide for the conveyance without consideration of certain lands in Stone County, AR, to certain persons deprived of property as a result of a 1973 dependent resurvey by the Bureau of Land Management; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 5630. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the disallowance of deductions for personal interest shall not apply to interest on loans used to buy fuel-efficient highway vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. SPENCE) (both by request):

H.R. 5631. A bill to authorize the disposal and acquisition of certain strategic and critical materials from the national defense stockpile and to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile Act to remove a limitation on the disposal of materials and to expand the authority of the President to rotate materials in the stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRUCE (for himself, Mr.

BLILEY, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, and Mr. BARTON of Texas:

H.R. 5632. A bill to establish a system for coding of plastic resin products and to promote recycling of plastics and use of degradable plastics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUSTAMANTE (for himself and Mr. LEATH of Texas):

H.R. 5633. A bill to create an interagency task force to review programs relating to the education of students in certain school districts receiving assistance under the Impact Aid Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLEMAN of Texas:

H.R. 5634. A bill to supercede part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to require a reduction of 5 percent per account under the final sequestration order for fiscal year 1991; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. HERTEL (for himself and Mr. McNULTY):

H.R. 5635. A bill to provide a penalty for increasing oil prices within 30 days after a declaration of war, the onset of military police action, or a major oilspill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois:

H.R. 5636. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to require as a condition of receiving formula grants that States have in effect a law requiring certain sex offenders to be tested, at the request and for the benefit of the victim, for the presence of the etiologic agent for acquired immune deficiency syndrome; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 5637. A bill entitled "The Improved Rural Railroad and Grain Car Service Act"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAWYER (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HILER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 5638. A bill to establish a Federal annuity program to compensate participants in private pension plans which terminated before September 1, 1974, for nonforfeitable pension benefits which were lost by reason of the termination, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 5639. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide immunity from damages to cable franchising authorities for cable regulatory actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LENT:

H.J. Res. 651. Joint resolution designating April 7, 1991, as "Just Pray No Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. Con. Res. 371. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress of the desirability of promoting energy efficiency and conservation, setting energy efficiency and conservation goals for the United States, and calling an energy summit; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD (for himself and Mr. YATRON):

H. Res. 465. Resolution congratulating President Vassiliou, the government, and the people of Cyprus on the 30th anniversary of independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

495. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to savings and loan bondholders; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

496. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to Federal contractors; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

497. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to the North American Waterfowl Management Plan; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

498. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to health insurance for retired teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS. Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3134. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joan R. Daronco (Rept. 101-715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROOKS. Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5001. A bill for the relief of Norman R. Ricks (Rept. 101-716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 885: Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 913: Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. PARKER, Mr. WISE, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

H.R. 1582: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 1608: Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BOUCHER,

Mr. BRUCE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. PRICE, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida,

Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HENRY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MARKEY,

Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 2037: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 2531: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ECKART, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 3164: Mr. BARNARD and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 3247: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3292: Mr. GORDON and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 3569: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 3700: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.R. 3734: Mr. HILER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. MADIGAN.

H.R. 4249: Mr. HERTEL, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. CRAIG.

H.R. 4308: Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 4309: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BATES, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. BEILSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 4369: Mr. BUECHNER.

H.R. 4389: Mr. BROWN of Colorado and Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut.

H.R. 4392: Mr. ECKART and Mr. NOWAK.

H.R. 4433: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 4465: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 4516: Mr. FOGLIETTA and Mr. LOWERY of California.

H.R. 4618: Mr. NAGLE.

H.R. 4640: Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 4672: Mr. OWENS of New York and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4680: Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 4755: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. COX, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 4808: Mr. DELLUMS and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 4850: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. INHOPE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.R. 5185: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 5201: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 5231: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SWIFT, Mrs. SAIKI, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GEJENSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 5331: Mr. FRANK, Mr. KASTENMEIER, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 5394: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 5423: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. JONES of Georgia.

H.R. 5427: Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 5429: Mr. OBEY.

H.R. 5443: Mr. EVANS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. KYL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. SABO, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 5449: Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 5455: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. RAY, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 5475: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BATES, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MACHTLEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 5521: Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 5538: Mr. BRUCE and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.R. 5553: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 5568: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CARR, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 5610: Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HILER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HUBBARD, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. PAXON, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. FRANK, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.J. Res. 57: Mr. PARRIS and Ms. PELOSI.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. CLARKE.

H.J. Res. 476: Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. RUSSO, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.J. Res. 513: Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. JENKINS.

H.J. Res. 543: Mr. WILSON, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. STANGELAND, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.J. Res. 566: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. APPLE-GATE, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.J. Res. 602: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COX, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr.

HOPKINS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, and Mr. RUSSO.

H.J. Res. 613: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. MFUME, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. TALLON.

H.J. Res. 628: Mr. SKELTON.

H.J. Res. 632: Mr. WALGREEN.

H.J. Res. 638: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MACHTEY, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. COX, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. YATES, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. CARR, Mr. GALLO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. TALLON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. WELDON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. EARLY, Mr. DARDEN, Mr.

McCOLLUM, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. PRICE, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HANCOCK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OLIN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RHODES, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. WEISS.

H.J. Res. 639: Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. HILER, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. APPLEGATE, and Mr. ANDERSON.

H.J. Res. 646: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 264: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H. Con. Res. 314: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Con. Res. 354: Mr. JONTZ.

H. Con. Res. 356: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 368: Mr. LEVINE of California and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H. Res. 312: Mr. CLARKE and Mr. BERMAN.

H. Res. 396: Mr. ROE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2798: Mr. SCHUMER.